The Bible Champion

Volume XVII. FEBRUARY, 1914. Number 2.

THE ARENA

An Examination of the Testimony of the Evangelists

SIMON GREENLEAF, LL.D.

Part 3.

Tribunals of Justice in conducting the examination of witnesses and weighing their testimony are governed by the following fundamental rule:

In trials of fact, by oral testimony, the proper inquiry is not whether it is possible that the testimony may be false, but whether there is sufficient probability that it is true.

It should be observed that the subject of inquiry is a matter of fact, and not of abstract mathematical truth. The latter alone is susceptible of that high degree of proof, usually called demonstration, which excludes the possibility of error, and which therefore may reasonably be required in support of every mathematical deduction. But the proof of matters of fact rests upon moral evidence, which we do not obtain either from our own senses, from intutition, or from demonstration. In the ordinary affairs of life we do not require nor expect demonstrative evidence, because it is inconsistent with the nature of matters of fact, and to insist on its production would be unreasonable and absurd. And it makes no difference, whether the facts to be proved relate to this life or to the next, the nature of the evidence required being in both cases the same. The error of the skeptic consists in pretending or supposing that there is a difference in the nature of the things to be proved; and in demanding demonstrative evidence concerning things which are not susceptible of any other than moral evidence alone, and of which the utmost that can be said is, that there is no reasonable doubt about their truth.

27. In proceeding to weigh the evidence of any proposition of fact, the previous question to be determined is, *when* may it be said to be proved? The answer to this question is furnished by another rule of municipal law, which may thus be stated:

A proposition of fact is proved, when its truth is established by competent and satisfactory evidence.

By competent evidence, is meant such as the nature of the thing to be proved requires; and by satisfactory evidence, is meant that amount of proof which ordinarily satisfies an unprejudiced mind beyond any reasonable doubt. The circumstances which will amount to the degree of proof can never be previously defined; the only legal test to which they can be subjected is, their sufficiency to satisfy the mind and conscience of a man of common prudence and discretion, and so to convince him, that he would venture to act upon that conviction in matters of the highest concern and importance to his own interest. If therefore, the subject is a problem in mathematics, its truth is to be shown by the certainty of demonstrative evidence. But if it is a question of fact in human affairs, nothing more than moral evidence can be required, for this is the best evidence which, from the nature of the case, is attainable. Now as the facts, stated in Scripture History, are not of the former kind, but are cognizable by the senses, they may be said to be proved when they are established by that kind and degree of evidence which, as we have just observed, would, in the affairs of human life, satisfy the mind and conscience of a common man. When we have this degree of evidence, it is unreasonable to require

more. A juror would violate his oath, if he should refuse to acquit or condemn a person charged with an offense, where this measure of proof was adduced.

28. Proceeding further, to inquire whether the facts related by the Four Evangelists are proved by competent and satisfactory evidence, we are led, first, to consider on which side lies the burden of establishing the credibility of the witnesses. On this point the municipal law furnishes a rule, which is of constant application in all trials by jury, and is indeed the dictate of that charity which thinketh no evil.

In the absence of circumstances which generate suspicion, every witness is to be presumed credible, until the contrary is shown; the burden of impeaching his credibility lying on the objector.

This rule serves to show the injustice with which the writers of the Gospels have ever been treated by infidels; an injustice silently acquiesced in even by Christians; in requiring the Christian affirmatively, and by positive evidence, *aliunde*, to establish the credibility of his witnesses above all others, before their testimony is entitled to be considered, and in permitting the testimony of a single profane writer, alone and uncorroborated, to outweigh that of any single Christian. This is not the course in courts of chancery, where the testimony of a single witness is never permitted to outweigh the oath of even the defendant himself, interested as he is in the cause; but, on the contrary, if the plaintiff, after having required the oath of his adversary, cannot overthrow it by something more than the oath of one witness, however credible, it must stand as evidence against him. But the Christian writer seems, by the usual course of the argument, to have been deprived of the common presumption of charity in his favor; and reversing the ordinary rule of administering justice in human tribunals, his testimony is unjustly presumed to be false until it is proved to be true. This treatment, moreover, has been applied to them all in a body; and, without due regard to the fact, that, being independent historians, writing at different periods, they are entitled to the support of each other, they have been treated in the argument almost as if the New Testament were the entire production, at once, of a body of men, conspiring by a joint fabrication, to impose a false religion upon the world. It is time that this injustice should cease; that the testimony of the evangelists should be admitted to be true, until it can be disproved by those who would impugn it; that the silence of one sacred writer on any point, should no more detract from his own veracity or that of the other historians, than the like circumstance is permitted to do among profane writers; and that the Four Evangelists should be admitted in corroboration of each other, as readily as Josephus and Tacitus, or Polybius and Livy.

29. But if the burden of establishing the credibility of the evangelists were devolved on those who affirm the truth of their narratives, it is still capable of a ready moral demonstration, when we consider the nature and character of the testimony, and the essential marks of difference between true narratives of facts and the creations of falsehoods. It is universally admitted that the credit to be given to witnesses depends chiefly on their ability to discern and comprehend what was before them, their oportunities for observation, the degree of accuracy with which they are accustomed to mark passing events, and their integrity in relating them. The rule of municipal law on this subject embraces all these particulars, and is thus stated by a legal text-writer of the highest repute:

The credit due to the testimony of witnesses depends upon, firstly, their honesty; secondly, their ability; thirdly, their number and the consistency of their testimony; fourthly, the conformity of their testimony with experience; and fifthly, the coincidence with collateral circumstances.

Let the evangelists be tried by these tests:

30. And *first*, as to their *honesty*. Here they are entitled to the benefit of the general course of human experience, that men ordinarily speak the truth when they have no prevailing motive or inducement to the contrary. This presumption, to which we have before alluded, is applied in courts of justice, even to witnesses whose integrity is not wholly free from suspicion; much more is it applicable to the evangelists,

whose testimony went against all their worldly interests. The great truths which the apostles declared, were that Christ had risen from the dead, and that only through repentance from sin and faith in him could men hope for salvation. This doctrine they asserted with one voice, everywhere, not only under the greatest discouragements, but in the face of the most appalling terrors that can be presented to the mind of man. Their Master had recently perished as a malefactor, by the sentence of a public tribunal. His religion sought to overthrow the religions of the whole world. The laws of every country were against the teachings of his disciples. The interests and passions of all the rulers and great men in the world were against them. The fashion of the world was against them. Propagating this new faith, even in the most inoffensive and peaceful manner, they could expect nothing but contempt, opposition, revilings, bitter persecutions, stripes, imprisonments, torments and cruel deaths. Yet this faith they zealously did propagate; and all these miseries they endured undismayed, nay, rejoicing. As one after another was put to a miserable death, the survivors only prosecuted their work with increased vigor and resolution. The annals of military warfare afford scarcely an example of the like heroic constancy, patience and unblenching courage. They had every possible motive to review carefully the grounds of their faith, and the evidences of the great facts and truths which they asserted; and these motives were pressed upon their attention with the most melancholy and terrific frequency. It was therefore impossible that they could have persisted in affirming the truths they have narrated, had not Jesus actually risen from the dead, and had they not known this fact as certainly as they knew any other fact. If it were morally possible for them to have been deceived in this matter, every human motive operated to lead them to discover and avow their error. To have persisted in so gross a falsehood, after it was known to them, was not only to encounter, for life, all the evils which man could inflict, from without, but to endure also the pangs of inward and conscious guilt; with no hope of future peace, no testimony of a good conscience, no expectation of honor or esteem among men, no hope of happiness in this life, or in the world to come.

31. Such conduct in the apostles would, moreover, have been utterly irreconcilable with the fact that they possessed the ordinary constitution of our common nature. Yet their lives do show them to have been men like all others of our race; swayed by the same motives, animated by the same hopes, affected by the same joys, subdued by the same sorrows, agitated by the same fears, and subject to the same passions, temptations and infirmities, as ourselves. And their writings show them to have been men of vigorous understandings. If then their testimony was not true, there was no possible motive for this fabrication.

32. It would also have been irreconcilable with the fact that they were good men. But it is impossible to read their writings and not feel that we are conversing with men eminently holy, and of tender consciences, with men acting under an abiding sense of the presence and omniscience of God, and of their accountability to him, living in his fear, and walking in his ways. Now, though, in a single instance, a good man may fall, when under strong temptations, yet he is not found persisting, for years, in deliberate falsehood, asserted with the most solemn appeals to God, without the slightest temptation or motive, and againt all the opposing interests which reign in the human breast. If, on the contrary, they are supposed to have been bad men, it is incredible that such men should have chosen this form of imposture; enjoining, as it does, unfeigned repentance, the utter forsaking and abhorrence of all falsehood and of every other sin, the practice of daily self-denial, self-abasement and self-sacrifice, the crucifixion of the flesh with all its earthly appetites and desires, indifference to the honors, and hearty contempt of the vanities of the world; and inculcating perfect purity of heart and life, and intercourse of the soul with heaven. It is incredible, that bad men should invent falsehoods, to promote the religion of the God of truth. The supposition is suicidal. If they did believe in a future state of retribution, a heaven and

a hell hereafter, they took the most certain course, if false witnesses, to secure the latter for their portion. And if, still being bad men, they did not believe in future punishment, how came they to invent falsehoods, the direct and certain tendency of which was to destroy all their prospects of worldly honor and happiness, and to insure their misery in this life? From these absurdities there is no escape, but in the perfect conviction and admission that they were good men, testifying to that which they had carefully observed, and well knew to be true.

33. In the second place, as to their *ability*. The text writer before cited observes, that the ability of a witness to speak the truth depends upon the opportunities which he has for observing the fact, the accuracy of his powers of discerning, and the faithfulness of his memory in retaining the facts, once observed and known. Of the latter trait, in these witnesses, we of course know nothing; nor have we any traditionary information in regard to the accuracy of their powers of discerning. But we may well suppose that in these respects they were like the generality of their countrymen, until the contrary is shown by an objector. It is always to be presumed that men are honest, and of sound mind, and of the average and ordinary degree of intelligence. This is not the judgment of mere charity; it is also the uniform presumption of the law of the land; a presumption which is always allowed freely and fully to operate, until the fact is shown to be otherwise, by the party who denies the applicability of this presumption to the particular case in question. Whenever an objection is raised in opposition to ordinary presumptions of law, or to the ordinary experience of mankind, the burden of proof is devolved upon the objector, by the common and ordinary rules of evidence, and practice in courts. No lawyer is permitted to argue in disparagement of the intelligence or integrity of a witness, against whom the case itself afforded no particle of testimony. This is sufficient for our purpose, in regard to these witnesses. But more than this is evident from the minuteness of their narratives, and from their history. Matthew was trained, by his calling, to habits of severe investigation and suspicious scrutiny; and Luke's profession demanded an exactness of observation equally close and searching. The other two evangelists, it has been well remarked, were as much too unlearned to forge the story of their Master's life, as these were too learned and acute to be deceived by any imposture.

34. In the *third* place, as to their *number* and the *consistency* of their testimony. The character of their narratives is like that of all other true witnesses, containing, as Dr. Paley observes, substantial truth, under circumstantial variety. There is enough of discrepancy to show that there could have been no previous concert among them; and at the same time such substantial agreement as to show that they all were independent narrators of the same great transactions, as the events actually occurred. That they conspired to impose falsehood upon the world is, moreover, utterly inconsistent with the supposition that they were honest men; a fact, to the proofs of which we have already adverted. But if they were bad men, still the idea of any conspiracy among them is negatived, not only by the discrepancies alluded to, but by many other circumstances which will be mentioned hereafter; from all which, it is manifest that if they concerted a false story, they sought its accomplishment by a mode quite the opposite to that which all others are found to pursue, to attain the same end. On this point the profound remark of an eminent writer is to our purpose: that "in a number of concurrent testimonies, where there has been no previous concert, there is a probability distinct from that which may be termed the sum of the probabilities resulting from the testimonies of the witnesses; a probability which would remain, even though the witnesses were of such a character as to merit no faith at all. This probability arises from the concurrence itself. That such a concurrence should spring from chance, is as one to infinite; that is, in other words, morally impossible. If, therefore, concert be excluded, there remains no cause but the reality of the fact."

35. The discrepancies between the narratives of the several evangelists, when carefully examined, will not be found sufficient to invalidate their testimony. Many seem-

ing contradictions will prove, upon closer scrutiny, to be in substantial agreement; and it may be confidently asserted that there are none that will not yield, under fair and just criticism. If these different accounts of the same transactions were in strict verbal conformity with each other, the argument against their credibility would be much stronger. All that is asked for these witnesses is, that their testimony may be regarded as we regard the testimony of men in the ordinary affairs of life. This they are justly entitled to; and this no honorable adversary can refuse. We might, indeed, take higher ground than this, and confidently claim for them the severest scrutiny; but our present purpose is merely to try their veracity by the ordinary tests of truth, admitted in human tribunals.

36. If the evidence of the evangelists is to be rejected because of a few discrepancies among them, we shall be obliged to discard that of many of the contemporaneous histories on which we are accustomed to rely. Dr. Paley has noticed the contradiction between Lord Clarendon and Burnett and others in regard to Lord Strafford's execution; the former stating that he was condemned to be hanged, which was done on the same day; and the latter, all relating that on a Saturday he was sentenced to the block, and was beheaded on the following Monday. Another striking instance of discrepancy has since occurred, in the narratives of the different members of the royal family of France, of their flight from Paris to Varennes, in 1792. These narratives, ten in number, and by eye-witnesses and personal actors in the transactions they relate, contradict each other, some on trivial and some on more essential points, but in every case in a wonderful and inexplicable manner. Yet these contradictions do not, in the general public estimation, detract from the integrity of the narrators, nor from the credibility of their relations. In the points in which they agree, and which constitute the great body of their narratives, their testimony is of course not doubted; where they differ, we reconcile them as well as we may; and where this cannot be done at all, we follow that light which seems to us the clearest. Upon the principle of the skeptic, we should be bound utterly to disbelieve them all. On the contrary, we apply to such cases the rules which, in daily experience, our judges instruct juries to apply, in weighing and reconciling the testimony of different witnesses, and which the courts themselves observe, in comparing and reconciling different and sometimes discordant reports of the same decisions. This remark applies especially to some alleged discrepancies in the reports which the several evangelists have given of the same discourses of our Lord.

(To be continued.)

THE BIBLE IN TENNYSON AND BROWNING.

Two great masters of poetry bear equally conclusive testimony to the power of the Authorized Version. Tennyson has gone to the Bible but little for the subject-matter of his poems; but how constantly he has drawn upon it for purposes of allusion appears in the fact that Dr. van Dyke has found in these poems more than four hundred Biblical references. In Browning the number of allusions is even greater. A shorter poem like "Christmas Eve" and "Easter Day" contains no less than a hundred, while in "The Ring and the Book" there are almost one thousand, which are distributed over twenty-eight books of the Old Testament and twenty-five of the New. Moreover, many of his best known and greatest poems, as the "Epistle of Karshish" and "A Death in the Desert," are based directly on Biblical subjects.—From "English Literature's Debt to the Bible," in *The North American Review*.

AN EXPENSIVE LIBRARY.

Robert Ingersoll was famous for the library of infidel books which he possessed. One day a reporter called on Mr. Ingersoll for an interview, and among other questions asked was:

"Would you mind telling me how much your library cost you, Mr. Ingersoll?"

Looking over at his shelves he answered:

"Well, my boy, these books cost me anyhow the Governorship of Illinois, and perhaps the Presidency of the United States!"

That accounts for most of his hatred of the Bible and the Church.

Is There a Place of Punishment Called Hell?

PROFESSOR L. T. TOWNSEND, LL.D.

Fourth Paper.

Materialistic Theology.

There are four generally recognized sources of knowledge; they are matter in its various forms, mind in its constitution and operations, history including the astronomical, geological and human periods, and lastly a record of influences, impressions or revelations whose source appears to have been supernormal, found chiefly in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Whatever subject is under discussion, philosophical, scientific, or theological, the sources of information are therefore limited, at the present time at least, to what can be learned from the study of matter, mind, history and the Bible.

Our friend Dr. Eliot is just as well, but not a whit better off, in this respect than the rest of the human family. In the discussion of the subject before us we confine attention to these sources, each of which has something to contribute. The teachings of the Bible and inferences from the thinking of distinguished men already have been discussed. We next give attention to the teachings of materialistic theology, which calls for an inquiry into the make-up of the natural world. Is it all smiles and no frowns; is it intoned with major to the exclusion of minor strains; does it, like the Bible, report both the goodness and austerity of the Creator and Governor of the universe? In reply to these questions it is safe to say that few can be found who are pessimistic enough to say that nature has no attractive or joyous moods, and fewer still, unless they have eyes that see not, who will deny that the most beautiful and attractive things on earth have for a counterpart things unattractive and distressing. Instead of soundness throughout there are flaws and decay in almost everything. There are agony and death on the most beautiful mountain slopes. On the same patch of sky where raindrops paint an arch of seven colors one sees a day or an hour later the forked lightning that smites to death a helpless household. If the winds are laughing now, they may tomorrow howl and screech into the ears of the terrified victims of a cyclone. The ocean at the evening hour sleeps, heaving gently its bosom, but before morning may be "tossing off men and vessels like seaweed." In this world there are gardens of the gods, but turning the eyes only a little, one can see the distressing shadows of every kind of Gethsemane and Golgotha. In the very neighborhood where men listen to the gladsome song of birds, later will be heard the shriek of the helpless sparrow in the bloody talons of the hawk or owl, and what more melancholy things are there than the sea bird's cry and "the sighing and soughing of the sea itself?" They who were on the playground an hour ago are now in the hospital, under the knife of the surgeon, or in the morgue where the dead are waiting recognition. Life with joy unbounded is in one apartment, but on the same street or under the same roof there are crushed and bleeding hearts because a dear voice will never again be heard there.

And in these affairs the Creator of the universe appears to be involved.

No one need be told, for instance, that in the nature of things fire when started never forgets to burn unless a miracle is wrought as in case of the three who were cast into the fiery furnace by King Nebuchadnezzar. It remorselessly lays waste cities and forests and burns to death men, women and children. And yet everything that constitutes fire is a creation of the God of nature. The same may be said of water. When it has a chance it never forgets to drown unfortunate victims, unless a miracle is interposed as in case of the Apostle Peter whom Christ saved from sinking when the waves threatened to overwhelm him. The summer bather is caught and strangled in the undertow if he ventures beyond the danger line. The thin ice never forgets to break when the skater or the careless boy slides onto it. If the iceberg is

not guarded against, the passengers of an ocean steamer, whatever their rank or wealth, sink to their death in the dark waters of the Atlantic. The freshet, too, is blind and merciless, overflowing river banks, flooding lowlands, and plunging into distress and bankruptcy those who dwell within its reach. But every element that constitutes water is a creation of the God who controls the nature of things.

So the earthquake when it has a chance swallows up the innocent and guilty alike. And the volcano with its ashes and lava drives people from their homes, leaving a waste where vineyards and farms had dotted hillsides and valleys. And the fact remains that he who made the world so arranged it that earthquakes and volcanoes constitute a part of its make-up. Essentially the same is true of lightnings and tornadoes, that in their destructive work are as heartless as anything one can imagine. In a word, we constantly are beset with agencies and forces that threaten and thwart us at every turn; the paths we tread are full of dangerous pitfalls; poisons may be in the air we breathe, the water we drink, and in the foods we eat. And the scientist assures us that nature's laws are ordained to kill off sooner or later all living things from the face of the earth, leaving the earth itself a waste and a void.

But, some one replies that we seem to have forgotten that there is an element of goodness in all these destructive, natural phenomena.

O no, we would not have it thought that we have forgotten anything that may be said of the reverse side of the picture presented, but are trying to discover from the nature of things whether the Being who rules the physical universe is something like the one revealed in the Bible.

We all very well know that without fire (the fire in the sun) all organized life on earth would quickly die; that without fire there would be in our northern latitude untold discomfort and suffering; that without water all organic life on earth would perish in a day; that without the earthquake and volcano the pent-up fires in the bosom of the earth would wreck it from pole to equator. The whole truth appears to be this, that in the austerity of the Creator and Ruler of the universe there is mercy; in his mercy there is austerity.

But has the thought occurred to some one that we have been overworking this dreadful problem? Well, then, let others speak.

In one of Mr. Ingersoll's popular lectures these words are employed:

"Do you know that nobody would have an idea of hell in this world if it had not been for volcanoes? They were looked upon as the chimneys of hell. The idea of eternal fire never would have polluted the imagination of man but for volcanoes."

Had Mr. Ingersoll been a careful thinker, instead of a mere orator and rhetorician, he would not, at the peril of his own theories, and in support of orthodoxy, have made such an announcement. For if what he says is true, the Bible and the Christian religion are not responsible for the idea of hell; it should be charged up rather against the nature of things, also against the constitution and operation of the human mind that on seeing a volcano thinks of hell. And a side question, though a little out of place, will be pardoned: What is it, on seeing a volcano that prompts the human mind to reach the conclusion that there is a hell? Or why is it, when men are angry with one another, and curse with terrific oaths, that hell is the word that rarely fails to be heard?

While criticizing another of Mr. Spurgeon's sermons, in which the character and administration of the God of the Bible had been under discussion, after quoting a statement made by Mr. Spurgeon, Mr. Ingersoll continues his criticism in these words:

"Just think of that picture of God the Eternal Father of us all! If these words of Mr. Spurgeon are necessary why are they not written everywhere in the world as well as in the Bible? They ought to be written on every tree and every field, and on every blade of grass. I say I am entitled to have it so. I say that it is God's duty to furnish me with this evidence."

Now, while Mr. Ingersoll in what he said was often in the highest degree unreasoning and almost brutal, still in this particular case his words are entitled to consideration. For certainly God should have made the publication of these matters so pro-

nounced that there could be no uncertainty in case of those who are unprejudiced and capable of sound reasoning.

But the fact is, that what Mr. Ingersoll demands is precisely what is written everywhere in the realms of nature. Scientific men, men of letters, and all others who have thought and spoken on these subjects, be they theists, atheists, agnostics, or of any other school, find written everywhere in the nature of things the austerity of God.

When, therefore, one is of a fault-finding mind, let him not discharge his noisy declamation against God and the Bible, but against the nature of things.

One whose name is not very familiar writes thus:

"Has it ever occurred to sentimental souls to rail against Nature for her cruelty in leaving a man with a broken limb to writhe in agony, or, if he survives the agony, to linger through a long life of pain and suffering, a helpless cripple? Or, if a man has violated any of the laws of his moral nature, why not rail against Nature for visiting him with some physical life-long deformity?"

These are fair questions; but why are the skeptic and atheist so long in answering them?

In quoting once more from Mr. Ingersoll we are met by the saying that Mr. Ingersoll is dead and buried and should be let alone. The fact, however, is that Mr. Ingersoll is not dead. Or rather, we may say, Being dead he yet speaketh; and there are many of *him*. Men we mean who think as he did, though they have not at command his rhetorical brilliancy, or his forceful, popular oratory. And it may not be wide of the mark to say that any man who berates the Bible and casts slur after slur upon the creed of the orthodox Christian Church is by so much a return of the departed Ingersoll.

But listen for a moment to the original Ingersoll and not to his ghost or double. The following is from one of his popular lectures:

"Now, let us see what kind of a God this book describes. In the first place, he drowned an entire world. Is it possible for the imagination of man to conceive of a more frightful thing? And yet that God tells me how to raise my children. Do you think he ought to do it when he had to drown his? What would you think of a father here who had to drown his children? I would rather worship a god of stone than one who would drown his own children. A stone god never did anything like that. I pray you, don't let these passages of Scripture (read from the Old Testament) pluck from your hearts the sweet blossoms of pity, and trample them beneath the bloody foot of superstition."

At first thought this looks bad for the Deity, and the people are ready to pay a dollar for admission to hear it, and then loudly applaud the speaker. It is, however, rather unfortunate for the Colonel and his followers that he was uninformed in matters of geological history, for few pages of that history are written in larger or clearer type than is the story of just such a deluge as Mr. Ingersoll describes and condemns.

Professor Esman, in his book *Travels in Siberia,* speaking of the deposits he discovered there, says:

"Everywhere throughout these immense alluvial deposits are now lying the bones of antediluvian quadrupeds along with vegetable remains . . . heaped together in great masses, young and old, those feeding on vegetables and those feeding on flesh, all swept into a common grave in beds of clay, surface gravel, slate, and loam."

Professor Huxley, in his study of the caves in the northwest of France, speaks of the bones of men, mammoth, hyenas, rhinoceroses, being washed "pell mell" into those caverns.

Professor James Geikie, in describing the deluge that actually has swept over the earth since the appearance of man, could do no better in describing the mixing of human and animal bones than to repeat the words of Professor Huxley, "they were thrown together 'pell mell.'"

In England, Wales, France, Belgium, Russia, India, China, Australia, New Zealand, and North Africa, according to Professors Huxley, Wright, and others, these same phenomena are discovered. The words of Professor Wright and there is no higher authority on this subject, are these:

"The appearances seem to be as if great herds of animals that usually do not consort together and that naturally live on the plains, were driven up the mountains by the rising waters until they perished together on their summits, and then, after a brief period of decay, were swept into the fis-

sures by waves of translation consequent upon the sudden re-elevation of the land."

Would Mr. Ingersoll as a lawyer, or will any of his followers, condemn the Bible because it contains an accurate though appalling historic record? The Bible writers did not lie about, or bring about, the deluge; they simply recorded the fact; and if we may employ the phrase, Robert Ingersoll is up against a fact—always a hard thing to be up against—the fact that in the providence of God or in the order of nature the entire world was drowned, and no one can say that it was not in the time of Noah. (See *Deluge, History or Myth?*)

But let us offer some direct testimony in support of what we have been saying as to the austerity discovered in the nature of things.

Professor John Fiske employs these words:

"There is little that is even intellectually satisfying in the awful picture that science shows us . . . a senseless bubble-play of Titan forces without life, love, and aspiration, brought forth only to be extinguished."

John Stuart Mill felt intensely the harshness seen in physical nature. In a work published after his death he says:

"For how stands the fact? That next to the greatness of these cosmic forces, the quality which most forcibly strikes every one who does not avert his eyes from it, is their perfect and absolute recklessness. They go straight to their end, without regarding what or whom they crush on the road. Optimists, in their attempts to prove that whatever is, is right, are obliged to maintain, not that Nature ever turns one step from her path to avoid trampling us into destruction, but that it would be very unreasonable in us to expect that she should do so. . . . In sober truth, nearly all the things which men are hanged or imprisoned for doing to one another, are Nature's every day performances."

James Martineau is an authority with many people, and this is what he discovers in the nature of things:

"The battle of existence rages through all time, and in every field, and its rule is to give no quarter, to dispatch the maimed, to overtake the halt, to trip up the blind, and drive the fugitive host over the precipice into the sea."

David Friedrich Strauss commands the attention and respect of every thinker. His interpretation of the nature of things is thus stated:

"In the enormous machine of the universe, 'mid the incessant whirl and hiss of its jagged iron wheels, amid the deafening crash of its ponderous stamps and hammers, in the midst of this whole terrific commotion, man—a helpless and defenceless creature, finds himself placed, not secure for a moment that, on an imprudent motion, a wheel may seize and rend him, or a hammer crush him to powder."

In Tennyson's poem entitled *The Cup*, after an invocation to the Divinity whose breath is balmy, is this tremendous counter-invocation to that same Power:

"O thou that slay'st the babe within the womb
Or in the being born, or after, slay'st him
As boy or man! O thou whose stormy voice
Unsockets the great oak, and rears his root
Beyond his head, and strows our fruits, and lays
Our golden grain, and runs to sea and makes
It foam over all the fleeted wealth of kings
And peoples:
Whose arrow is the plague, whose quick flash splits
The midsea mast, and rifts the tower in the rock,
And hurls the victor's column down, with him
That crowns it! O thou
Who causest the safe earth to shudder and to gape
And gulf and flatten in her closing chasm
Doomed cities,—hear!
Whose lava-torrents blast and blacken a province
To cinder,—hear!
Whose winter cataracts find a realm and leave it
A waste of rock and ruin,—hear!"

It is quite the popular thing for the skeptical world to condemn orthodoxy because it seems to dethrone the fatherhood of God.

But does orthodoxy do this any more than does the nature of things?

Wenwood Reade's murmurings against what God has done, led him, as they will almost any man, to the verge of atheism;

"God might have made us all happy, and He has made us all miserable. God might have made us all pure and He has made us all sinful. . . . . We open the book of Nature and find it inscribed with blood and tears. Life is one long tragedy; creation is one great crime. Love may be a solace to one, a torture to others. Oh cold,

cruel, miserable life; how long your pains, how brief are your delights!"

The author of the *Martyrdom of Man* sums up his studies with this complaint:

"The convent prays, and the castle sings; the cottage hungers, groans and dies. Here and there a star in the heavens; here and there a torch upon the earth; all else is cloud and bitter wind."

It is found that nature in all its fearful business is not like a mother who speaks before she strikes, but nature, as Professor Huxley says, "gives her blow without a word, and you are left to find out as best you can why your ears have been boxed."

But is God responsible for this misery, wretchedness and unfitness in the nature of things? That is not the question. We are thus far trying to prove that the Being called God, revealed in the Bible, is the same kind of a being as to his austerity that is discovered in the nature of things; and we have been trying to do this by reaching an induction derived from what may seem to some a prodigality of data, consisting of scientific facts and opinions of scientists and philosophers, which if necessary and if time permitted could be multiplied tenfold, and one of the discoveries made, to employ the words of a noted scientist, is this, that the physical world is "blind as fate, brutal as tyranny, and merciless as death." It is crowded full of "the jagged points or orthodoxy."

Now, when the skeptic says that the God of the Bible is without pity and ready to punish without mercy any infraction of his law, the only reply really called for is this: As a matter of fact that charge is no more true in case of the God of the Bible than in case of the God of the scientist and philosopher, revealed in the nature of things.

If, therefore, we condemn the revelations of the Bible, there remains the physical universe to be dealt with. And if those passages in the Bible that are the most strenuously objected to by the skeptic—those in Old Testament history, those in the imprecatory psalms of David, those in the threatenings of Ezekiel, and in the announcements of other prophets and of the apostles, that represent the austerity of God's administration, and if there are added selections taken from the sermons of the early New England divines in which are depicted the wrath and indignation of Jehovah against iniquity and sin, are carefully studied, there will be found nothing in them all that for austerity any more than equals the revelations of nature's God, as interpreted by Professor Tyndall, Professor Fisk, by Strauss, Jevons, Mill, and by every scientist and philosopher who has ever spoken on these subjects, be he theist, atheist or agnostic. These evidences of austerity are not hidden here and there, but if the eye is not closed or averted they can be seen anywhere and everywhere and at any time.

The rejoinder by the unbeliever is this: I would not make a world such as this we are living in if I were the Creator. Well, what does that matter whether you would or not? Here is the world; there is a maker of it, and what are you to do about it? And suppose he has ordained a hell, you cannot order it out of the universe.

Mr. Beecher in 1867 announced his belief in the salvation of all men. But earlier in his ministry he held the orthodox view, and had he continued in that belief it might have been far better for himself and his followers. His earlier view of the subject was thus expressed:

"The thought of future punishment for the wicked which the Bible reveals is enough to make an earthquake of terror in every man's soul. I do not accept the doctrine of eternal punishment because I delight in it. I would cast in doubts, if I could, till I had filled hell up to the brim; I would destroy all faith in it; but that would do me no good; I could not destroy the thing itself."

Says Mrs. Stowe:

"Any father who should make such use of power over his children as the deity does with regard to us, would be looked upon as a monster by our very imperfect moral sense; yet I cannot say that the facts are not so."

And another writer on these subjects has asked these pertinent questions:

"Would a father on earth consign his children to poverty, shame, sickness, loss of reason, and death, attended with the most afflicting circumstances? Would a father on earth choose to plunge his children into the ocean, and leave them to the mercy of the tempest? Would he set a child's house on fire while he was buried in soft slumber, and consume him in the flames?"

Eminent Defenders of the Doctrine of Future Punishment.

We begin with John Calvin, a Frenchman by birth, who at the age of thirteen gave himself for ten years to the study of language, logic and philosophy, in each of which he became proficient, and as a compliment to his remarkable ability and achievements the French University of Orleans conferred upon him a doctorate without the customary fees, an honor very rarely bestowed upon any one. His famous treatise, *The Institutes,* which systematized the views of thinkers who had preceded him and paved the way for the German reformation that changed the face of society and put Europe in the way of every sort of reform, were written when he was only twenty-five years of age. Subsequently he held a professorship of divinity in Strassburg; then devoting himself to law, he became scarcely less eminent as a lawyer and statesman than as a theologian. He was consulted and deferred to by kings and potentates, and not only framed the ecclesiastical order and civil laws of Geneva, but ruled that city of twenty thousand inhabitants with a skill and wisdom rarely equalled in the government of any other city or state in all Europe. The historian Bancroft in more than one paragraph attributes the modern impulse to republican liberty to the republic of Geneva. Calvin was so distinguished that thirty years after his death Cardinal Alexander De Medici, afterward Pope Leo XI, while on a journey through Europe, left his attending retinue and on foot went to see the cottage where he had been told "the great Calvin" was born.

There is one reproach, and only one, that clouds the name of this distinguished theologian and statesman—the charge of cruelty to Cervetus. The facts, however, are not usually stated with fairness. Cervetus not only was a heretic and skeptic, but in other ways was regarded as a "dangerous and obnoxious citizen." It also should be said that they were the magistrates of Geneva who judged him worthy of death, and though Calvin consented to the execution he used all his influence, though in vain, to save the condemned man from being burned at the stake.

It is beyond question that John Calvin had one of the most acute, profound, comprehensive and thoroughly disciplined minds of the century in which he lived. And this man reasoning from the revelations of the Bible, from the nature of things from personal experience and observation and from the outcome of his own profound thinking, reached the conclusion that God has prepared a place of confinement and punishment for the wicked, called hell.

Now, are the opinions of such a man to have no weight in the settlement of one of the profoundest questions that has agitated the theological world? Before voting against John Calvin, and before voting for a man who has given far less time to law, logic, metaphysics and theology, we would better think the matter over; and think it over twice.

The name of another man may be mentioned in this connection, one who did more perhaps than any other to improve the condition of the English people during the eighteenth century. He was a gentleman born and bred, as much so as any man who ever walked the mall along the river Charles. His energy, his organizing power and mastery over men rarely has been surpassed. His was the busiest, and in some respects the most important, life of the century in which he lived. He was a remarkable scholar, and read Homer's Odyssey and Iliad, Virgil's Aeneid and the Letters of Cicero as a pastime. He was not only proficient in Greek and in Latin, but was familiar with the French and Spanish tongues, and in his day was one of the best read German scholars in Great Britain. He held an appointment as Greek lecturer in Lincoln College, wrote thirty volumes, and among them his *Journal,* which gives a better idea of the English people during the eighteenth century than that found in any other writing of his day. The noted English historian Lecky in his *History of England* covering that century says of this man: "He manifested at all times an exaggerated passion for reasoning." And among religious reformers there is no nobler figure, no purer example of life consecrated to culture and to an unselfish service to humanity and to God than that of this man, John Wesley, who stands at

the head of a million people.

His various studies, his knowledge of the Bible, his familiarity with people in all the walks of life, and his "passion for reasoning," led to the firm conviction that there is a hell that awaits those who on the day of final judgment shall be pronounced "accursed."

Should not the opinion of such a man have weight in settling theological questions, since on these questions the twentieth century has no advantage at all over the centuries that have preceded?

But did not the opinions of these two men, Calvin and Wesley, differ from each other? Not in the least on this question we are now considering. Here their views were the same, and on some other questions they were not so wide apart as many people suppose.

This review would not be complete if one other name already mentioned, that of Jonathan Edwards, were passed unnoticed. Among college-bred men of the last century Edwards was chiefly known as the author of the *Inquiry into the Nature and Range of the Freedom of the Will.* This treatise is usually named *Edwards On the Will.* But his other publications are of scarcely less merit. His sermons on "The Nature and Reality of Spiritual Light," "The Excellency of Christ," "True Grace," and "The Wisdom Displayed in Salvation," as examples of sermonic excellence in melody, sweetness, culture and inspiration, are hardly surpassed in the whole range of sermonic literature. And it is very doubtful if any sermons since the days of the Apostles have produced more remarkable results than those on "God's Absolute Sovereignty," "Man's Utter Helplessness," and "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." These sermons were preached at a time when the American people were fast lapsing into atheism, selfishness and licentiousness, and were largely instrumental in bringing about the signal revivals and reforms of 1740-44. But, perhaps, as has been suggested by the critics, his sermons are too elaborate and profound to be read and appreciated in this age of ours. This, however, may not be so much against the sermons as against those who offer the criticism and who, in one way or another, have incapacitated themselves for profound theological reading and thinking.

The transcendent skill of Edwards as a metaphysician, his profundity as a theologian, his splendid type of piety, his royal and superb personality, easily secured a following of some of the best minds this country ever has known. His metaphysical writings, especially when the scant literature and unfavorable conditions that hampered him are taken into account, must be ranked almost without an equal in the history of American literature, and had a marked influence not only upon the thinking of America, but on that of Scotland, where some of his writings were first published, and on that of Wales, England and the Continent. Isaac Taylor characterized his Treatise on the Will as "a classic in metaphysics." Sir William McIntosh, in his valuable essay on *The Progress of Ethical Philosophy,* refers to Edwards "as the metaphysician of America, in subtle argument perhaps unmatched, certainly unsurpassed, among men." Speaking of this same treatise, Emanuel Fichte, the eminent German metaphysician, employed these words: "This solitary thinker of North America has attained here to the most fundamental and also the loftiest ground which can underlie the principles of morals." And in our own country from a quarter hardly expected Edwards has been highly eulogized. Dr. John Fiske, professor in Harvard while under the administration of ex-President Eliot, after calling Edwards a "giant personality," in an address entitled *Liberal Thought in America,* employed these words:

"Few figures in history are more pathetic or more sublime than that of Jonathan Edwards in the lonely woodlands of Northampton or Stockbridge, a thinker for depth and acuteness surpassed by not many that have ever lived, a man with the soul of poet and prophet, wrestling with the most terrible problems that humanity has ever encountered, with more than the courage and candor of Augustine or Calvin, and with all the lofty inspiration of Fichte or Novalis."

On the marble monument that covers his remains in the cemetery at Princeton, written in sonorous Latin, is this eulogy:

"Wouldst thou know, O traveler, what manner of person he was whose mortal

parts lie here? A man in the acuteness of his intellect second to none among mortals; in sacred criticism eminent; a theologian without an equal; an unconquered defender of that type of Christian theology which is commonly known as Calvinism."

This man, Jonathan Edwards, as we said before, preached sermons on the nether world such as never have been heard from other lips since the days of Christ and his apostles. And men of our day may scoff at his preaching all they please, and say they do not believe it, but they cannot answer it, and his reasoning remains to this day firm as the foundations of the earth.

Ye men who echo the words, "I do not believe in hell," read Jonathan Edwards, follow his reasoning, grasp his thought as best you can, before pronouncing against him in favor of any belated comer. Edwards unquestionably is qualified three or four times over and above any man now living in this country or any other to pass judgment upon the stupendous problem of a future life.

And it should be borne in mind that these men, John Calvin, John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, are the representatives of a vast multitude of Calvinists and Arminians resident in Germany, Great Britain, America, and elsewhere in civilized lands, among whom have been presidents of colleges and universities, professors of science, theology and philosophy, men in every learned profession, authors in every field of literature, men held in as high repute for intellectual insight, knowledge and wisdom as any who have ever lived—these men have been convinced from evidence found in the revelation of the Sacred Scripture, especially in the teachings of Christ, also from evidence discovered in the constitution and operation of the human mind and in the nature of things, that there is a place of punishment where will be banished the souls of such persistent workers of iniquity as are enumerated in the New Testament.

Other names come to mind that we mention without comment—those of Augustine, Anselm, St. Bernard, Wycliff, Jerome of Prague, Dante, Savonarola, John Huss; those of the stalwart reformers, Zwingle of Switzerland, Luther of Germany, Cranmer of England, John Knox of Scotland; those of such Methodist commentators and theologians as Richard Watson and Adam Clark; and men of commanding influence such as Oliver Cromwell, John Bunyan, and John Milton; famous revivalists such as George Whitfield, Charles Spurgeon, Dr. Nettleton, Dr. Kirk, and Dwight L. Moody, who stirred to a better life America and Great Britain as no other man of late years has done; such Baptist scholars and theologians as John Rogers, Roger Williams, John Gill, Andrew Fuller, John Foster, William Carey, Christmas Evans; such masterly theologians and educators among Congregationalists and Presbyterians as Samuel and Mark Hopkins, Drs. Bellamy, Dwight, Emmons, President McCosh, Charles Hodge, and others of Princeton; Professors Wood, Stewart, Park, and Shedd of Andover, and the great scholars and theologians of the Roman Catholic Church who have adorned the centuries with pen and voice.

And there should also be brought into this enumeration such bodies of believers as the Huguenots, the Dutch Protestants, the Scotch Covenanters, the English Puritans, the framers of the Augsburg Confession, and of the Westminster Catechism, the drafters of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Scottish Confession of Faith, the signers of the Heidelberg Confession, and those of the Boston Confession of 1680. Where can one stop? BRAINS! Brains by the ton, brains of the finest texture, brains in the most shapely skulls that God ever made, brains above hearts the most tender and sympathetic that ever beat in a human bosom! O ye men of this later generation who deal in echoes and who venture to repeat the words, "I do not believe in hell," pause for a while; think soberly for an hour or two; let memory and conscience have a quiet while in which to speak; then perhaps the echo of denial will no longer be heard among the majestic mountains of God's eternal truth.

(To be continued.)

A Question as to Witnesses.

President Charles A. Blanchard, Wheaton College, Ill.

Human knowledge is derived from various sources. We become acquainted with the external, material world through the senses. We learn of the external immaterial world through language and by other sign sources. That is to say. I know a tree because I see it. I know what a man thinks or feels by what he says or by the way he looks. We learn of distant material and immaterial beings and facts through testimony; e. g., I know that Caesar crossed the Rubicon because reliable historians tell me that he did, and I know a little about his feelings as he plunged into the stream by what he himself, said. I know the mosque of St. Sophia to be in Constantinople because I have seen it, but I know the mosque of Omar to be in Jerusalem because persons whom I trust have said that it is there. Careless thinkers imagine that the testimony of the senses is more valuable than the testimony of witnesses, but those who have thought the matter through with even a small degree of thoroughness, understand that testimony of witnesses may be and often is more reliable than testimony of sight or hearing.

We know the world within us through consciousness; not by the senses, not by testimony, but by the direct action of the soul. I know when I am glad or sad, when I love or hate, when I pity or am indignant. I do not have this knowledge by way of the senses. I do not see or hear or touch or smell or taste any of these great intellectual or emotional facts, but I know them. I know them as well as if I could apprehend them by the senses. In fact, these knowledges are more reliable than sense knowledges.

I know also through direct, rational activity. I do not think or guess or suppose that a part is less than the whole, or that the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts. I know these facts. I know them beyond all question. I know them immediately. All rational beings know them as well as I. The very supposition of the contrary is an absurdity; but I do not know thus by the senses, or by testimony, or by consciousness alone. To be sure consciousness underlies and is a condition of all knowledges, but it is not the cause of the rational intuitions. If some wise man, some higher critic, for example, should suggest to me that, while events occurring in this world must have causes, in Jupiter or Saturn the case is quite different; that there events are uncaused; I might be kindly disposed toward this wise man, I might try to believe him, but it would be impossible, and at the end of my effort, just as at the beginning, I should know, not guess or think or suppose, but know that events anywhere in the universe of God are caused events, that without a force in operation, no change can take place.

I have not dwelt on the sources of knowledge because I suppose my readers to be ignorant of them. I have not enumerated all the sources of knowledge; e. g., reasoning is as valid a source of knowledge as Reason, though it gives us a totally different series of facts, but I called attention to this subject because so many persons write and speak as if they had never thought upon it. It is needful not only that we know, but that we think, recall, recognize, if we are to speak or write helpfully. So I close this section of my topic by urging that all persons who wish to think accurately and helpfully, give a little attention to the sources of human knowledge. It will always be impossible to tell what action Congress has taken on a given case through taste or sight. We shall have to have testimony; that is to say, we must learn, if we are not personally present, from those who were present or who have become informed. We shall never be able to know what a given landscape is through consciousness alone, since perception must be called into action. We shall never be able to arrive at the knowledge of infinity in space, time, or cause through the senses, through consciousness, through testimony or through reasoning. The reason will give us infinity

The Value of Testimony.

directly or we shall never attain it at all.

Passing from the general subject which we have thus imperfectly and hastily dealt with to the topic of testimony as a source of knowledge, we have narrowed our field and may, therefore, see more in detail. What is it which makes you believe one witness while you doubt a second and disbelieve a third? Why is it that some facts received upon testimony you believe as firmly as you believe in your own existence, while other alleged facts intimated by testimony do not influence you at all? Your mind simply drops them out. You consider them valueless. It is evident that this introduces us to the question, "Upon what does the value of testimony depend?" and I remark first it depends upon

The Character of the Witness.

You do not believe the testimony of a man whom you know to be a bad man as you do the testimony of one whom you know to be virtuous, a man of integrity. You may believe a statement that the evil person makes, but you will not have the same feeling about it if you know the witness's evil character, as you will if you know the witness to be worthy. Often times the property interests of men, sometimes even the lives of men depend solely upon the character of the witness.

The competence of the witness is a very different qualification, but it is equally real, though less important. You do not trust the testimony of a man ignorant of the subject on which he speaks, even if he is a good man, as you do the testimony of a man thoroughly informed, even should he be less worthy. There may be cases where character will overcome incompetence, but this is not the rule. A person who wishes to be trusted in any given field is bound to inform himself. No man has a right to ask to be believed unless he will establish a character and acquire a body of information which will enable sane people to believe what he says.

It is obvious that the number of witnesses has also a bearing on the belief of testimony. If many good witnesses testify to a certain state of fact, and one or two equally good witnesses testify to the contrary state of fact, you are driven by the constitution of your mind to believe the larger number. If the smaller number should be more fit, the larger number may be overruled in your thinking, but the case being as first supposed, the witnesses being equal in character and equal in competence, you must believe the larger number.

The distance in time and place of witnesses also has a bearing on human belief. If equally good witnesses, equal in number and in competence, testify in one way and an equal number of equally good witnesses equally competent testify in another way, you will necessarily, from the constitution of your mind, believe those who are nearest to the events in place and time; e. g., if twenty Hebrew scholars who lived in the first century believe that Isaiah is the author of the prophecy which bears his name, and twenty equally competent, equally worthy scholars of the nineteenth or twentieth century do not believe that he wrote the prophecy which bears his name, you will be compelled, from the constitution of your mind, to believe the scholars who were of the first century to have been correct, and the scholars of the nineteenth to be mistaken. It is obvious that if the Hebrew scholars of the first century were more competent witnesses than those of the nineteenth, if they drank in as a matter of birth the language which the nineteenth century scholars learned slowly and necessarily imperfectly, if manners and customs which the first century students knew through life long observation while the nineteenth century scholars know them by such testimony as they can get, you have here a difference in competence as well as a difference in time, and of course, any rational being will be forced to accept the testimony of the first century as against the testimony of the nineteenth.

What Are We to Believe About the Bible?

I do not need to speak of the fundamental character of this question. I think I could prove to the satisfaction of any honest man fairly intelligent that the religion of a man or a nation is the determining factor in the life of that man or nation. I think it is easy to show that the industrial, commercial, intellectual, social, political institutions of any people are determined by their religious faith. I have not time to go into this subject now. I refer any one who doubts to the history and the geography of the world. I have no thought that any fairly intelligent person will doubt this fundamental proposition if he will study these two sources. I shall assume that this proposition is admitted, that the religion of a nation determines all its other interests, that the nation which has a true religious faith will prosper, while a nation which has an evil religious faith will decay and die.

This brings us to the foundation of the Christian religion. What is it? Some of those who desire to be accepted as authorities on this question in our time are accustomed to say that the Christian religion does not depend upon a book, but depends upon a person. In this erroneous statement there is a sufficient percentage of truth to make it acceptable to persons who do not think carefully, but those who do so think, see at once that if the person is revealed by the book, and if we have no authentic and complete information regarding him which is otherwise derived, then the Christian religion does depend upon a book. It seems very strange that any person who has any title whatever to the name of scholar should ever have failed to see this great fact, should ever have been willing to speak as some do respecting this matter, but the truth is obvious and does not require argument to one who is competent to form an opinion. We do not know a single fact respecting the life, work, and teaching of Jesus Christ which we do not derive from the Bible. Why then should any man say that the Christian religion depends upon Jesus Christ and not upon a book? Of course, ultimate dependence is upon God. He alone can reveal Himself in His true character, and He has done this in this book. What we know of Him, we know through this book, and it is idle far beyond the limit of absurdity to talk about the Christian church, the Christian faith as derived from any other source.

The Bible a Unit.

It is equally absurd to speak of the Bible as made up of a large number of books of differing value, some of which may be rejected while others are retained. A thoughtful student sees, as he goes forward in Bible study, that while it is made up of parts as other organic beings are, these parts are all related, and each has its important place in the completed work. Sin; a plan of salvation; the working out of that plan; the end of the plan; this is the plan. A sinless pair in a sinless world; a sinful pair with sinful descendents working out the shames and miseries which have followed, which do follow, which will follow sin; a Saviour prophesied; a people separated; a Saviour present; a church begun; the rage of the world; the rage of Satan; the bush burning, but not consumed; the Saviour come again for the glorification of His church, for the destruction of His enemies, the throne of His father David; the universal empire of the righteous king among his majestical people; this is the Bible.

Now, the question is, how shall we think of this book? This question is to be determined by the testimony of witnesses and by the testimony of work. What people say of it, what we see it do; these are the questions which must be answered in order to get a rational judgment respecting this matter.

Jesus Christ and Sir Oliver Lodge.

Jesus Christ and His disciples are personal witnesses to the teaching of the Old Testament. Any person who can read English or German or French or Latin or Greek or any other tongue of the civilized world can easily ascertain what Jesus

Christ and His disciples thought about the Old Testament. The New Testament is the work of the personal disciples and followers of Jesus Christ. Of course, they become not simply authors, but witnesses. They do not write from a literary point of view, but as religious leaders and teachers, and in general they sacrificed their property interests, their reputations, their liberties, even their lives in confirmation of the testimony which they gave. If we believe what these men said, we shall accept the Bible in its historic sense. If we look upon the Bible as some of the so-called scholars of our times represent, we shall have a totally different opinion concerning it. Historically it will have no value for us. The historic view is absolutely negatived by these alleged scholars. Historically the first five books of the Bible are assigned to Moses. All the witnesses of the nation and of the time when it was beginning its great work, ascribed it to him. After hundreds of years, men of alien race, of alien tongues, of inferior acquaintance with the language, manners, customs, social, political, industrial, religious institutions of the Hebrew race, undertake to negative the testimony of the cloud of witnesses who were by place and time and education best qualified to give an opinion.

Both in General and in Detail.

This statement is true both in general and in detail. The Bible in its various portions is discarded as a whole, and the particular doctrines which it teaches are by these same men called in question; e. g., take the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Bible declares that He was in a peculiar sense the Son of God, that He did not have a human father. This statement was accepted for centuries by all people who professed to believe the Bible. Now men are accepting salaries for teaching the Bible who instruct their students that this fundamental statement is doubtful or untrue. Take the fact of His resurrection. This also was distinctly affirmed by many witnesses. The church was builded upon this in large measure. Wherever the disciples went they preached Jesus and the resurrection from the dead. Now men who wish to be considered scholars and who profess to teach the Bible are informing us that this statement is doubtful or untrue. Some say they do not believe it. Others say it is not so. Both classes of men contradict the testimony of millions of believers through hundreds of years. Take the question of the immortality of the soul. The Bible clearly teaches it. Jesus told men that it was better to suffer the loss of all earthly good than to have soul and body destroyed in hell. These alleged scholars now tell us that there is no hell, and some of them go forward to say that the very existence of the soul is to be doubted or denied. Gross materialism is too ridiculous to be affirmed even by these wise men, but grossest materialism is a legitimate inference from the doubts and doctrines which they have been teaching.

Jesus or Sir Oliver Lodge.

Recently the distinguished scientist whose name I twice coupled with the name of our blessed Lord gave an address before a learned society in Great Britain. It is a beautiful piece of writing, thoughtful and candid and earnest throughout. Toward the close of this address he takes up the question of the immortality of the soul from the standpoint of science and not at all on the authority of the Bible. He declares that it is impossible to deny the independent spiritual existence of man with the natural inference that this independent spiritual existence lives after the body has fallen away. A great shout of approbation goes up from the world. "Now we can believe in the immortality of the soul. Sir Oliver Lodge says that we may." "We could not believe on the the testimony of Jesus Christ." "We could not believe on the testimony of His disciples." "We could not believe on the testimony of the Bible." "Sir Oliver Lodge is a great man." "He has studied the thing through." "He proves to us scientifically that we can believe in the immortality of the soul, in the spiritual existence of mankind; therefore, we will believe."

This tragic episode in the life of the church would be less serious but for one fact. The devil knows very well that if the immortality of the soul is not to be believed on the authority of Jesus Christ and His disciples, on the authority of the Bible, in a word, but is to be believed because a certain man has scientifically determinated it, then it will be perfectly possible for him to keep mankind busy doubting and finally believing until they have largely dropped into hell..

I do not object to books written to prove the virgin birth of Jesus Christ. At the same time, I have never read such a book, and I do not care to read such a book. I have never read Dr. Orr on this subject, not because I think I should dissent from any of his arguments or conclusions, but because that whole question is settled for me by the word of God. I do not believe that any person who rejects the testimony of Scripture will be particularly helped by the testimony of Dr. Orr. I believe that persons who, on the authority of Jesus Christ and His prophets and apostles, have accepted that doctrine, will find their faith confirmed and will greatly enjoy what Dr. Orr or any other intelligent scholar will write on that subject, but I do not wish to be shut up on such a question as that to the testimony of any man living in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. If all the men who live in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries should contradict the testimony of Jesus Christ, His prophets and apostles, I would not believe them. I do not consider them competent witnesses. I do not understand the brazen impudence of men who desire to be considered competent witnesses against Jesus Christ and His apostles. I am weary with the whole set of men who call themselves scholars who reject the only competent witnesses there are and who set up for themselves or for others a series of dogmas which have no foundation except in their own foolish and incompetent thinking.

I believe that any person who understands the laws of evidence and will give attention to them will accept the Bible as the word of God. I do not see how other people are to be helped very much in any way. "To the law and to the testimony; if men do not speak according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.—*Wheaten College, Illinois.*

THE CHURCH A CURB ON CRIME.

The testimony of Judge Lewis Fawcett, of Brooklyn, to the power of the Church in curbing crime is a pretty satisfactory answer to those who are harping upon the present-day ineffectiveness of our churches. Judge Fawcett says: "Approximately 2,700 cases have been brought before me in my five and a half years' service on the bench. During all this time I have never had to try a man who was at the time of the alleged offence, or ever had been, an active member of the Church."

A Chicago judge who has tried many divorce cases says that rarely, almost never, were parties to the divorce suit active church workers.

Crime now costs us $700,000,000 a year. It would cost us ten times that if there were no churches. It would cost us hardly any of that if all were in the churches. Really, the man who is living in our crime-free, respectable towns and does nothing for the church is living on charity. He is profiting from the Church's curb of crime, but is giving nothing in return.—*The Expositor.*

WHEN MARK TWAIN WAS SERIOUS.

Mark Twain writes, in one of his notebooks, a passage that may well take its place among the best things ever said about the style of the Old Testament:

"It is hard to make a choice of the most beautiful passage in a book which is so gemmed with beautiful passages as the Bible. Who taught those ancient writers their simplicity of language, their felicity of expression, their pathos, and, above all, their faculty of sinking themselves entirely out of sight of the reader and making the narrative stand out alone and seem to tell itself? Shakespeare is always present when one reads his books; Macaulay is present when we follow the march of his stately sentences; but the Old Testament writers are hidden from view."—*Presbyterian.*

Pseudonymous Science---A Call to Ministers.

Dyson Hague,

Vicar of the Church of Epiphany; Professor of Liturgics, Wycliffe College, Toronto; Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, Ontario, 1908-1912.

About five months ago the following letter of mine was published in the Toronto "Globe," probably the most widely circulated morning journal in Canada:

"Will you allow me, through the columns of your very widely-read paper, to utter a protest against the way in which some of the standard papers, magazines, and illustrated journals are serving out to the public, in the name of science, what is, after all, little more or less than the most fanciful theorizing. All of the papers lately have been giving accounts of the recently found Sussex bones and in the Illustrated London News for the 17th of May we have a whole page taken up with pictures of the famous Piltdown skull, with an article in which the writer strives to prove, first, that the skull is that of a human being of a very remote age, and second, that it presents many ape-like characters; all of which, of course, goes to show the monkey ancestry of the man. In the name of common-sense, one surely must protest against conclusions being made in the name of a severe and exact science, which are on the face of them so utterly theoretical! Take for instance the picture of the jaw-bone to prove the chinless condition; or of the restored skull when compared with that of the chimpanzee; or the flint implements which are given as 'proof of the period.' All of them ought to be put in the category of mere suggestion, supposition, and surmises. As to the dates as proved by these eoliths, a modern French scientist has repudiated even the idea of their being made by man, and alleges that the action of sand and water sufficiently accounts for them all. It is a great pity, therefore, that so much is being served out to students and to the reading public with regard to so-called primitive man, and the connecting links, which is sheer romance. And the glib way in which leaders of repute in the scientific world describe the details of the so-called primitive man, and the aeons ago that he existed, clearly shows us that in their eagerness to substantiate the evolutionary theory, scientists are posing as dogmatists, and speaking with a dogmatism in what is, after all, as Sir William Dawson once said, in the present state of knowledge, the region of a gratuitous hypothesis."

About two months after the publication of this letter, the International Medical Congress met in London, England, and the subject which produced probably the greatest sensation was the discussion of this same Piltdown skull. Dr. Keith, the curator of the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, and one of the most brilliant palaeontologists of the day, not only said that the Piltdown skull as modelled was an impossible skull, but was, in fact, *the dream of a diseased imagination.* He then went on to make the remarkable statement that if Dr. Woodward, the geologist who constructed the skull, was right in giving the jaws of a chimpanzee to a skull that was human, then all the rest of the world was wrong.

The other day, in the Sunday School Times for October 18th, Professor George Frederick Wright, one of our ablest scientific thinkers, protests in a most severe philippic against the way in which our papers and magazines to-day are filled with so-called deliverances of science that are utterly baseless, and after showing the utter fatuity of basing any strictly scientific conclusion upon the romance of the Java man or of the Piltdown skull, concludes by saying that science is never going to present any true data which really conflict with the statements of the Bible.

It is refreshing to read a statement like that in this day. It is like an echo of the able and uncompromising statements of one of the greatest of modern scientists, Sir Wm. Dawson, who once stated that all that we know of primitive man from geological investigation presents no contradiction to the history of his origin in the Bible; but rather gives such corroboration as warrants the expectation that as our knowledge of pre-historic man increases, it will deepen our faith in the Word of God. (*Nature and the Bible,* p. 180.)

Now, if these things be so, what is the matter with so many modern ministers? Many of them seem to have gone over to the enemy, and in many cases to have struck their flag without striking a blow.

The so-called "conclusions" of modern science have been accepted as if they were finally and overwhelmingly proved. Writers in religious journals of high authority, talk with airy ease about the "millions of years ago" that men lived, and as if all the missing links necessary to establish the evidences of progression from the ape to the man, had been discovered and scientifically arranged, and ministers receive their assumptions and accept their theories, as if they were as worthy of all acceptation as the divinely inspired statements of the Bible. How is it that ministers are so easily scared, and so easily accept the hypotheses of the Darwinian school? No evolutionist has ever yet proved a single instance in which one species has been changed into another. Darwinism is being shaken, even in Germany itself; Haeckel's Monistic Evolutionism is a series of the most monstrously fanciful assumptions; the famous Java bones are entirely human, and, as has been recently determined, are of post-tertiary, and not of tertiary age, as was at first supposed; the Engis, Cro-magnon, and Menton skulls are also entirely human; and the Piltdown skull is a joke.

The fact of the matter is, ministers seem hardly to realize what it means when they, the accredited champions of the Divinely-inspired revelation, the Word of God, calmly announce that they are prepared to have accepted theories with regard to the antiquity of man's residence upon this earth and of his origin, which plainly contradict not only the opening chapters of the Word of God, but many of its statements throughout. For myself, I feel that no minister should ever allow any man to talk about these hundreds of thousands and millions of years, without stopping him point-blank and saying—"How do you know? What is your proof?" Take for instance the gravel pit in Sussex. They say it was several hundred thousand years old. What man living could prove that? They say the period of the gravel proves the age of the bones. But suppose the bones were found in that gravel pit, what proof is there that the bones were as old as the gravel? And because there are certain eoliths scattered round or near certain bones, what living scientist could ever prove that those eoliths were made by the man, or handled by the man, or were as old as the man, or had any connection with the man whose bones the bone fragments were conjectured to be?

We do believe that it is time for ministers to call a halt and to take a different attitude with regard to so-called scientific discoveries and theories. The gullibility of some modern scientists is beyond all reason. In their eagerness to find anything whatsoever, any idea whatsoever, any way whatsoever, that will in a slight degree give color to their evolutionary assumptions, they gulp, with the greediness of an impatient boy, the most unverifiable probabilities. We stand on a solid rock. The Word of the Lord endureth forever. And we wish that more men of the type of Professor Townsend, whose "Collapse of Evolution" ought to be in the library of every English-speaking minister of the gospel, and of Professor G. F. Wright, whose sober and serious style is in such contrast to the romancings of men like Professor Schafer and Professor Keith, would come to the help of the Lord against the mighty foe-forces of this age. Take, for instance the Dundee address of Professor Keith on Modern Problems Relating to the Antiquity of Man, one of the most curiously illogical things ever delivered. It was not science. It was simply surmise throughout, and surmise highly seasoned with unproved and unprovable postulates which may or may not be probable, and abounded in possibilities, and indications, and probabilities, and assumptions, and inferences, and theories of extraordinary importance and far-reaching scientific interest based upon the most ridiculously irrelevant scraps of evidence. It is a shame to think that men speaking in the name of science build so much on things that are not and cannot be proved, and admittedly at their very best, are only working *hypotheses*.

One word in conclusion. Ministers of the gospel should never forget that the animus of many of these derisive disregardings of the teachings of the first few chapters of Genesis and the Bible generally, is the annihilation of God, and the

glorification of evolved man. Modern scientists very commonly set aside, as devoid of all scientific foundation, the idea of immediate supernatural intervention that is, the inspiration and Divine authority of the Word, as if there were no God, no Creator. And too frequently ministers of the gospel accept almost as gospel, ideas and theories proceeding from men whose initial impulse is the denial of God and his truth. The faith ever is a fight. It's all a question of choice of side.

"The Awakening of Protestantism."*

Dean James M. Gray, D.D.

"Dean Shailer Matthews, Divinity School of the University of Chicago, gives five arguments or illustrations to show the truth of his contention, that American Protestanism is Awakening."

1. *"The rise of the scientific attitude in Biblical study and theological thought.'* This means the thinking of the gospel 'in the terms of evolution and democracy.' This thinking has produced a change so radical, we are told, as to be measured only by the great epoch which marked the fourth century of the Christian era—a date which sober students of the Bible and church history have regarded as marking the rise of apostasy in its first organized form. But, judging by what Dr. Matthews says, the epoch we now are entering surpasses that in its progress on the down-grade, for the Nicene Age still held to an 'authoritative orthodoxy,' while in this any claim of authority, 'except as a survival, will have passed.' He finds cause for congratulation in that 'heresy trials like that of Dr. Briggs will never again shake the Presbyterian body'; that the Methodists of the North will never again depose for his teaching 'another Professor Mitchell'; that the words 'heretic' and 'orthodox' are passing into disuse except as 'repartee'; that every Protestant theological seminary, except those 'narrowly denominational,' teaches the composite nature of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and the Synoptic Gospels, and that since the death of Dr. William Henry Green, of Princeton, 'there has been no worthy champion of anti-criticism in America.'"

2. *"'The findings of physical and biological science.'"*

"Unfortunately there is no unanimity just now as to what these 'findings' are. But this difficulty appears to be more imaginary than real, since these 'Protestant thinkers,' in their eagerness to get away from the cosmogony of the Bible, will follow any leader for a while if only he be headed in that general direction. So increasing is this 'open-mindedness' in American Protestantism that it is now 'freed from many of those anxieties which disturbed it a half-century ago when Mr. Ingersoll could be regarded as a veritable Anti-Christ'; so that, if that eloquent infidel were now here, Protestantism and he would be much nearer one another than they were then,—not because of a change in Mr. Ingersoll, but because of the change in Protestantism. In this remark, by the way, there is a predictive element, since it will be recalled that the 'veritable Anti-Christ' who is to come, will be so acceptable to the Protestantism of his day as to be worshipped as the very God."

"Our author describes the way by which all this is being brought about. 'The best theological schools' are doing it, and by the happy plan not of meeting or answering the problems, but ignoring or 'outgrowing' them, which in this case is practically the same. 'The new type of theological instruction in pulpit and Sunday School is steadily shifting interest from metaphysics to psychology'; which means, as is explained, that such themes as Divine sovereignty, human responsibility, innate sin, free grace, and the Nature and Persons of the God-head are 'archaic,' inasmuch as progressive Protestantism is more anxious to be scientific than 'credally orthodox,' though how it can be one without the other is not stated."—*James M. Gray*, D.D., Dean, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1913.

* Refused by the *Constructive Quarterly*.

Sir William M. Ramsey's Lectures

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., October 28 to November 4, 1913.

Reported by Rev. V. H. Starbuck, B.D.

The writer has from the first been a loyal member of the Bible League, and has felt the keenest interest in its battles (or OUR battles) in defense of the faith once delivered to the saints. Hence it was a peculiar privilege to attend the recent lectures on the James Sprout Foundation delivered at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., October 28 to November 4. This school of the prophets, which celebrated its centennial more than a year ago, is often confused with the younger institution of similar name and more notoriety, located in New York. As a matter of fact, however, Union Seminary in Virginia has always stood among the most conservative schools in the world. In selecting the lecturer and subject for this occasion the Seminary fully sustained her reputation. The subject was "The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament," and the lecturer was the great savant Sir William Mitchel Ramsay. This gentleman is beyond question one of the greatest scholars of the age. In a series of seven lectures he met the radicals on their own ground and smote them "hip and thigh, horse, foot, and dragoons, from Dan to Beersheba."

The writer now attempts to give his fellow members of the Bible League a sketch of the arguments presented.

Professor Ramsey's purpose was to consider the archæological evidence, and from the light thrown thereby to argue for or against the reliability of the New Testament text. He admitted that when he began his researches thirty-four years ago he had strong prepossessions against the writings of Luke. He would study the surroundings in which the incidents recorded took place, and learn what meaning the earliest readers of the New Testament derived from the narratives and epistles. The historical background must serve as a witness for or against the truth of the whole. If the details are found false it is reasonable to suppose that the whole story is false. Twenty years ago scholars had great doubts about the whole New Testament, and even thirty years ago Luke in particular was disputed by all the leading critics.

But Luke is bold enough to indulge in particulars. E. G., in the story of Paul's voyage and shipwreck the details are so accurate that no one could ever doubt that the narrator was present and knew all the circumstances. But almost the whole of the remainder of Luke's writings were set aside as untrue.

The passage especially considered in the first lecture was Acts xiv. 6. Here the author states that Paul and Barnabas fled from Iconium into the region of Lycaonia. Scholars long regarded this as a serious inaccuracy, on the supposition that Iconium was itself located in Lycaonia, and consequently the statement was much like saying that a man left Richmond and went to Virginia. Investigation, however, showed that Xenophon about 400 B. C. came to Iconium in Phrygia and later crossed into Lycaonia. A Roman martyr about 165 A. D. said that he was born in Iconium of Phrygia. A certain bishop 231 A. D. locates the place in Phrygia. But the crowning proof was found by Professor Ramsey in 1910. At this time a public building was in process of erection. Workmen dug into a hill in the center of the town to obtain good building stone, and found inscribed stones. Professor Ramsey offered to take the work of digging up rocks at his own expense in order to secure and study these inscriptions. The Turks' suspicions were at once aroused, for they could imagine no reason for such an offer unless the Scot was in quest of gold. After much diplomacy, an arrangement was made whereby the city engineer became a sort of watchdog and Professor Ramsey managed the quarry. These inscriptions unmistakably proved that the Phrygian tongue was used in Ico-

nium as late as 250 A. D. side by side with Greek and Latin.

Professor Ramsey compares Luke with Sir Walter Scott, who is found to be extremely accurate in describing scenery and surroundings in his native land, but less so as the distance from home increased. So it might reasonably be supposed that Luke would be the same way. He could be exact in the voyage with Paul because he was there; but how about other places where he was not present? Professor Ramsey's researches led him to the conclusion that Luke is invariably accurate. If the third Gospel and Acts were written in the second or third century, as so many critics so long confidently claimed, we would expect the author to be accurate in details only when copying from the manuscript of an eye-witness, as in Acts xxvii., but inaccurate in other cases. In ancient times there was little desire for accuracy in details, and consequently it would be far less probable for a third century writer to be accurate than for Scott to secure accuracy in his Palestine novels.

In other matters the same accuracy of detail is found. In Ephesus the guild of shrine makers is found to have been large and important enough to raise the stir so correctly described in Acts xix. The scene on Mars Hill could have been enacted nowhere else in the Greek world but in Athens, nor would the uncomplimentary term "*spermologos*"—(babbler)—have been heard anywhere else. All this evidence proves conclusively that Luke was the friend and pupil of Paul.

Lecture II.

Dr. Ramsey now takes up certain passages where conflicts occur between Christ's teachers and sorcerers. The science of the occult was popular then and such conflicts were unavoidable. In Acts xvi. 16 ff. we find the case of a firm that possessed a very profitable slave girl. This soothsayer or mind-reader, observed in Paul and his companions a far greater power than her own. Her resulting announcement is couched in pagan language and ideas. She believed in a Supreme God that was above all elemental powers and she knew that relations with such a God were to be preferred. "The way of Salvation" is also a pagan expression, and refers largely to material safety, prosperity, long life, etc. Many persons in the pagan world were engaged in showing this way of salvation. Paul was annoyed, and when he faced her with a stern command, the very sensitiveness which gave her the power that made her valuable, showed her that she faced a power far above her own. The result was that she lost her power.

In Acts xiii. 6 ff. we find Sergius Paulus interested in good things. Hearing of Paul and Barnabas, he supposed them to be wandering teachers and began to investigate their claims. Up to this time the best guide that Sergius Paulus could attach to himself was the false prophet Elymas, who now began to tremble for his influence over the deputy. He feared ousting and tried to turn away the deputy from the faith. It was the crisis in Paul's life. Filled with the Holy Ghost, he accused Elymas of being "full of all guile and villainy." The personality of the magician withered before the power of the Holy Spirit in Paul—and henceforth Paul is always the leader of the company of missionaries.

In Acts viii. 9 ff. a certain Simon claimed to be "An incarnation of the Supreme Power in human form." This was a popular idea in the Roman Empire, as seen in the ascription of deity to the Caesars. Simon, observing that Peter and John possessed a power greater than his own, offered to buy it. The secret must be his, but he would gain it by paying a fair and honest price.

In Acts xix. 13 ff. certain Jews who were exorcists would make use of Paul's power without paying any bribe or tuition fee, as in Simon's case. They use Jesus as a name to conjure with but without making any fair return. The result in the case of Sceva's seven sons was sad and disappointing.

All these cases agree with the conditions of the times; and yet no two cases are exactly alike. The general similarity to one another and to prevailing cases of a like nature, and yet the striking differences, declare loudly that the author is relating actual occurrences. In all this also there is more or less of the miraculous. The

principle lying at the base of the system of advanced radical critics is that such narrative *must* be untrue. Yet the narrative otherwise cannot be refused credence. The critic's ground is, "cut out the miracle and believe the balance." Professor Ramsey says this is impossible. It is in conflict with the principle that history stands or falls together. Admit the narrative of the shipwreck or of the conflicts with the occult in general and the miraculous must be accepted too.

Here we may remark that towards the close of the series of lectures some of the faculty, students, and alumni of the Seminary seemed a little afraid that Professor Ramsey himself questioned the reality of miracles. The writer is of the humble opinion that the discussion in this second lecture proves him not guilty.

(To be contnued.)

OUR QUIZ.

"Do you reallly think the Bible is infallible? For instance: Do you believe the universe was made in six days and that the Sabbath dates from the day after?"

"Do you think that *but for sin,* man would have been forever a naked inhabitant of a garden, living on the fruits of trees, and his wife naked also—like two savages?"

"Do you think the Lord was under the necessity of *going down to see* whether there was exaggeration of the report of the evil of Sodom?" "Do you think Joshua caused a stationary sun to stand still?"

"Do you believe the dead in ancient times went down to a place called *Sheol,* if Hebrews, or *Hades,* if Greeks? Do you think there was ever such a place?" "Do you think Abraham has been in such a dreary hole these thousands of years?"

"Do you think the world rests on water, and that the sky is a solid dome keeping back a vast flood? Do you think that Abraham saw God as a man walking the earth, or do you agree with John that no man hath seen God at any time?"

"Do you think that John the Baptist was infallible when he said he was not Elijah, though Jesus said he was? Was Malachi infallible when he prophesied that Elijah would come again, though he did not come?

"Do you think Peter was infallible when he thought it would be a sin to eat what the Lord had commanded him to eat? Or was he infallible when he believed it would have been a sin to enter into the house of one of another nation? Or when he played the traitor to the truth and was rebuked by Paul to his face? Was Paul infallible, even though he was not sure himself whether he had the Spirit of God?"

"Do you think belief in the Virgin Birth to be essential to salvation or to Christian discipleship? If so, how is it that it formed no part of the way of salvation as set forth by Jesus, Paul, John, James, Peter, Jude or Mark? Did these all ignore so vital a matter?"

"Do you think I will be lost for asking such questions?"

No, friends, you are all mistaken! These are not quotations from Colonel Ingersoll. He has not yet found a way to get a message to us. Besides, he has changed his view-point, and his convictions by this time. These questions are by a Mad Methodist Minister. Doubtless each question has been a topic about which a sermon was gathered. Don't you sympathize with the people that had to listen to it all?

"Wholly apart from its ethical or its religious value, the Bible is the one book that no intelligent person who wishes to come in contact with the world of thought and to share the ideas of the great minds of of the Christian era can afford to be ignorant of. All modern literature and all art are permeated by it. It is not at all a question of religion or theology or dogma. It is a question of general intelligence. A boy or girl at college in the presence of the great works set for either to master, without a fair knowledge of the Bible is an ignoramus and is disadvantaged accordingly."—*Charles Dudley Warner,* in *A College Address.*

OUR PARABLE.

The Injunction Against Santa Claus.*

A Christmas Story by the Editor.

Kent's Cross-Roads was not much of a town. It had a country-store and a Post-office, all in one; a blacksmith shop; a little unpainted schoolhouse; and a dozen farm-houses scattered irregularly within half a mile of the Post-office. There was no Church. There was no Sunday School, nor any kind of a religious meeting. The little hall over the store had been used as a preaching place, once a month, by ministers from a distant town, several years ago; but the preachers were discouraged by the lack of interest and stopped coming. The hall was now used for a place of public gatherings and the stated assembly of the Town Council. As the young people had all gone to the city, any form of social life had ceased, save the Fourth of July celebration and a Christmas Tree for the few children, about twenty of whom, of all ages, irregularly attended the little schoolhouse.

The leading spirit of the community was the storekeeper, who was also Post-master, and Moderator of the Town Council. He was also the banker and carried on a small loan agency. He had been very secretive in his business and held a good many small mortgages on the property of his fellow-townsmen. He did not believe in the Church and was largely responsible for the indifference to religion. He disclaimed being an infidel; he possessed a Modern Mind, as he loftily called it. He had read some of the newer books teaching that the Bible was merely a human book, and retailed the information to the men, who gathered in the evening at his store.

At one of these evening gatherings, near the holidays, nearly every man in town was present. Some one jokingly asked:

"Why don't you hang up some Christmas decorations, pictures, wreaths, bells, or at least a portrait of Santa and his reindeer?"

"I don't believe in Christmas! There is no Santa Claus and never was! I have just been reading The New Bible by a Yale professor. He is a great scholar. His book is used by all the colleges and endorsed by all the churches. I can read you in two minutes every word there is in it about the Baby Jesus. There are only twenty-one verses. There is no angel nonsense, no shepherd foolishness, no wise men *fol de rol.* There is nothing but just a baby story like any other one. All the rest is make believe, put in by somebody to fool the people. It ain't no news to me. I have had Thomas Jefferson's Bible for years. He wrote the Declaration of Independence. I guess he knew what he was about when he made his Bible. He cut out of this baby story everything that any justice of the peace would stop if it was offered as evidence by a witness in his court. He has no more angels, or shepherds or wise men, than the Yale professor. I think we've been fooled long enough. I've called a special meeting of the Town Council to vote that there shan't be any Christmas in town this year, nor no year again. The Santa Claus and Christmas tree humbuggery can't be held in the town hall no more."

"Kind of a perpetual injunction agin Old Santa comin' any more, huh?" said one of the men with a laugh and a wink to the others. He was the only man in town not in debt.

The discussion was only half-hearted and entirely non-committal by every man. He remembered his mortgage was subject to call with only a few days' notice. The names of Thomas Jefferson and the Yale professor filled every one with awe. One by one, the men went home to tell their families the sad news. That night every house was in mourning. The one bright

* Told at Trinity M. E. Church, New York, December 28, 1913.

spot in all the dreary winter months had been blotted out. The children would not be comforted, but cried themselves to sleep. The parents talked the matter over with sad hearts. None of them professed to be religious. They had so few holidays that they treasured them very jealously. Christmas meant more than the others; it seemed to give them at least a little hold upon sacred things. To have Santa shut out, meant the Christmas carols, the Christmas story, which the school teacher had always looked after, were to be omitted. The teacher in disgust declared to the family with whom she boarded that week, that she was going some place for her Christmas where the people were not heathen. She might just as well be a missionary in a heathen land and be done with it.

The next day after the conversation at the store, a small boy was driving a wagonload of farm produce to one of the great summer-houses which was to be opened for holiday week. The boy had learned from his father that the town council was to meet and serve an injunction on Santa Claus and stop his coming to town. The small boy was the only child in town that did not cry. He was mad enough to swear but only got as far as "I vum!" He felt somehow it would not be right to swear about Christmas. While he rode along, he was sad a while, then he was mad. As he proceeded he was less sad and more mad. He had looked forward to Christmas with special anxiety. His company of soldier boys had been drilled to take part in the Christmas doings, and now it was all off. He did not speak for fear he should say "I vum!" again. He never whistled, even. He did not hurry the old nag, who was just creeping along. The old fellow, noticing that something out of the ordinary had happened, because he had not been hit once, travelled as slowly as possible, to keep going. The small boy never noticed how the old horse was dragging one foot after the other, until he woke up from his dream when the horse stopped at the gate.

A big boy was sitting on the wall by the gate. He laughed as he said:

"I've been watching you for half an hour. The only way I could tell you was moving was by noticing that after a while you got by a telegraph pole. It's lucky for you that it is two days to Christmas. If it was any nearer you would miss it. You could not get home in time."

The small boy never looked up as he replied:

"I wouldn't care if it was New Years before I got back. We hain't goin' to have any Christmas this year. The Town Council are goin' to get out an injunction agin Santa comin'."

The big boy just whistled, and then sat still for a long time, thinking. After a while, the old horse having rested a bit, remembered that there was always hay at the end of this journey. He started with great effort and dragged himself through the gate to the barn door, and stopped to rest again and munch the hay that was ready for him. The boys unloaded the wagon in silence. After it was unloaded there was some more silence. Then the big boy laughed.

"An injunction against Santa Claus coming!"

Then another laugh. It was such a ringing, rollicking, hurrah kind of a laugh that it plainly told something had broken loose for joy's sake. The small boy began to smile, then he tried to laugh in a poor whimpering kind of a way; then something broke in his forlorn little heart and he began to laugh in earnest. He sat down on the ground and laughed and shrieked as if he were crazy. When his breath gave out and he had to stop, the big boy was still going. When he stopped to get a new breath, the small boy asked:

"What are you laughing at?"

"The idea of getting out an injunction against Santa Claus!"

Santa's name sobered the small boy and his fun was over. He spoke very dolefully:

"You can laugh, because you don't live at Kent's Cross-Roads. If you did, it wouldn't be so funny."

Then the big boy got sober. He spoke very earnestly:

"Now, look here, son! Are you game? Do you want to become a real sport and go in with me and teach your old Town Council a thing or two?"

The small boy just held out his little hard, brown hand. The big boy clasped it

in his big white, hard hand and held it tight as he said in a loud voice:

"Say this after me! Cross! Cross! Double-Cross my heart! I'll be true to the Death! Santa may depend upon me till after Christmas! I vow it by the Wish-Bone of the Turkey, the Cranberry Sauce, and the Plum Pudding I hope to eat!"

"But," said the small boy, "is there any Santa Claus? My little sister Virginia heard some one say that if you saw it in the *Sun* it was so, and she wrote a letter to the editor. He wrote back. Here's the letter."

The big boy read the letter. His eyes began to brighten, and then to dim a little as he brushed away a tear. His cheek was red as a girl's by the time he had finished. He climbed up into the wagon, dragging the small boy with him. Holding the letter aloft, he began to shout:

"Three cheers for the *Sun!* Three cheers for Santa! Three cheers for Virginia! A tiger for us true Knights of the Turkey-wish-bone!"

Sobering down to his real self, he sprang out of the wagon, gave the old horse some grain and some more hay. Taking the small boy by the arm he led him into the house. They walked through room after room; walls were festooned with evergreen, pictures were surrounded by green wreaths, a Christmas tree was in every corner of every room. Men were hanging up electric lights everywhere, red, white and blue. It seemed like a castle of wonders as the big boy hurried the small boy up several long flights of stairs to the tower. It was the big boy's den. The two boys spent an hour looking at the wonderful things that covered the walls and shelves and table. A great clock downstairs struck twelve and burst out into glorius chiming.

"Sounds like Christmas, don't it? That means lunch! We'll have ours here!"

He gave the order down a speaking tube. With one sweep of the hand he cleared everything off the table into a heap on the floor. The empty table was soon filled with things to eat. So fine, so much, the small boy's mouth began to water, then his eyes; he had hard work to catch a sob that started up from his hungry little heart. The big boy jumped up and ran to the window and stood looking out a long while. Then the boys sat down and ate and ate, and then ate some more. The hungry small boy, for the first time in all his life, stopped eating because he could eat no more, and still there were lots more to be eaten.

"Now, son, the plot! We are conspirators! You are to go to the Town Council meeting. You are the Ambassador from Santa Claus. You are to read to them the letter from the editor of the *Sun*. Your credentials and a letter of instructions will be sent you by special delivery to-morrow morning. Every mother—no, every woman—will receive a letter from Santa Claus giving them full instructions what to do. I'll see to the rest. All up!"

Both boys sprang to their feet; both shouted as with one voice: "Cross! Cross! Double-Cross my heart! I'll be true to the death! Santa may depend on me till after Christmas! I vow it by the Wish-Bone of the Turkey, the Cranberry Sauce, the Plum Pudding, I hope to eat!" Both boys clasped hands as they repeated the vow of the Order of Knights of the Turkey Wish-Bone.

How the small boy got away he did not know. His head was in such a whirl. He was so dizzy he did not know whether he was on his head or his heels. Maybe, it was because, before getting into the wagon, he turned three handsprings forward, then three backward, and then cart-wheeled out to the gate and back. The big boy cheered like mad, as the small boy, still panting, lifted the reins and the old horse started home. The old nag was so surprised that he forgot and started off in a trot; he did not get over his surprise or his trotting until he reached the door of his own stable. The small boy saw nothing, heard nothing, until greatly to his surprise the horse stopped at the stable door.

The next morning's mail brought a letter to every woman at Kent's Cross-Roads. It also brought a great official envelope to the small boy by special delivery. "*The White House*, Washington, D. C." was on the corner of the envelope. It was handed to him with great secrecy by the mail-carrier, as he whispered, "From the President."

The small boy hurried up to his den in the attic. It was a sorry affair com-

pared to the den in the tower, but it was his own. He had made it with his own hands. It was only a big box around a window, the sides reaching to the shingle roof overhead. All his treasures were there; an old shot-gun, an old pair of skates, left him by his brother Bill who had run away; a few tools, a fishing rod, some tackle, and a few books. The walls had pictures cut from illustrated papers. The only piece of furniture was an old lounge. He sat down upon the lounge and carefully opened his letter. It was a typewritten document formally appointing him Ambassador from Santa Claus to the Town Council, by the hand of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States. Filled with wonder, he examined the great gold seal at the bottom, then he looked at the signature of the greatest man in the country, yes, of the world, and then at his own name. He could not believe it. He threw himself down upon the creaking old lounge and buried his little face in the thin pillow and cried and cried and cried; then he laughed and laughed and laughed. He was a very sober boy all the rest of the day.

The Town Council was called to order by the Moderator. A few items of town business were attended to. Then the chief business was taken up by the Moderator. He made about the same remarks he did at the evening gathering in his store. He called for discussion. No one seemed to care to speak. Just as the vote was about to be taken, there was a loud knock at the door. The one nearest opened it. The small boy stepped in and walked straight up to the Moderator's table. He handed the Moderator his credentials signed by President Woodrow Wilson. He waited until the Moderator had read the letter, then he took the credentials from the Moderator and spoke in a loud, clear, steady voice:

"I am the Ambassador of Santa Claus to the Town Council appointed by President Woodrow Wilson. I am instructed to read this letter from the editor of the New York *Sun*." He read the letter in a voice that did not have a single quiver of fear or excitement.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY SUN, NEW YORK CITY.

Dear Little Virginia:

We take pleasure in answering your letter in the same way we did that of a little namesake of yours, a little Virginia, eight years old, who wrote us ten years before you were born.*

Virginia, your little friends are wrong. They have been affected by the scepticism of a sceptical age. They do not believe except they see. They think that nothing can be which is not comprehensible by their little minds. All minds, Virginia, whether they be men's or children's, are little. In this great universe of ours man is a mere insect, an ant, in his intellect, as compared with the boundless world about him, as measured by the intelligence capable of grasping the whole of truth and knowledge.

Yes, Virginia, there is a Santa Claus. He exists as certainly as love and generosity and devotion exist, and you know that they abound and give to your life its highest beauty and joy. Alas! how dreary would be the world if there were no Santa Claus. It would be as dreary as if there were no Virginias. There would be no childlike faith then, no poetry, no romance to make tolerable this existence. We should have no enjoyment, except in sense and sight. The eternal light with which childhood fills the world would be extinguished.

Not believe in Santa Claus! You might as well not believe in fairies. You might get your papa to hire men to watch in all the chimneys on Christmas Eve to catch Santa Claus, but even if they did not see Santa Claus coming down, what would that prove? Nobody sees Santa Claus, but that is no sign that there is no Santa Claus. The most real things in the world are those that neither children nor men can see. Did you ever see fairies dancing on the lawn? Of course not, but that's no proof that they are not there. Nobody can conceive or imagine all the wonders there are unseen and unseeable in the world.

You may tear apart the baby's rattle and see what makes the noise inside, but there is a veil covering the unseen world which not the strongest man, nor even the united strength of all the strongest men that ever lived, could tear apart. Only faith, fancy, poetry, love, romance, can push aside that curtain and view and picture the supernal beauty and glory beyond. Is it all real? Ah, Virginia, in all this world there is nothing else real and abiding.

*An editorial in the *New York Daily Sun*, published in answer to a similar letter by a little Virginia, September 21, 1897, and republished December 25, 1913.

No Santa Claus! Thank God! he lives, and he lives forever. A thousand years from now, Virginia, nay, ten times ten thousand years from now, he will continue to make glad the heart of childhood.

When he had ended he started to retire. The Moderator angrily shouted to the small boy's father:

"Is this tomfoolery a part of your game to show disrespect to me after all I have done for you? If it is, I'll talk with you after the meeting adjourns."

The father started toward the small boy, with hot rage in his heart, but trembling with an icy chill of fear. He knew what that meeting after adjournment meant to him. He fairly screeched with anger:

"You little rascal! Wait till I get you home! I'll give you the worst hiding of your life!"

The small boy coolly replied:

"You remember you licked Brother Bill last year for nothing. A man cussed you, who could lick you, and you dassent fight, and you took it out on Bill. Bill ran away that night. You've never heard from him since. I have. He has a good job. He has one for me. The next time you lick me for nothing I am to telegraph him and go, and he'll meet me. The barn filled with hay and grain and stock went the same night Bill did. Somehow it took fire just before Bill left. I'm not as big as Bill, but I'm big enough to scratch a match."

He wheeled about as if on parade. With head high, and body stiff and erect, with steps as regular as a soldier's, he marched to the door and went home and up to his den. He locked the door of his den, and after seeing that the old shot-gun was loaded, laid down and in a minute was sound asleep, apparently. A whistle under the window caused him to awaken in a flash. He opened the window and throwing out a rope ladder was soon down on the ground. The great automobile of Santa Claus was waiting, and he sprang in and found it chock-full of the women and children of the town. The small boy, as became the general-in-chief, was the last of his army to leave.

The Moderator looked each man in the face with a deliberation that sent a chill down each individual backbone. "All who vote for the resolution, stand up!"

Every man was in debt at the store. It had become the custom for years to run a bill during the winter and pay in the spring and fall. They had all cheerfully paid a little extra for the accommodation. Every man present had tried once to have a note renewed or extended. They never tried again. Now they recognized the light in the eye and the tone of the voice; they instinctively knew that the man who did not rise would have his account closed that night and the mortgage on land or tools or furniture foreclosed the next day. The resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote.

When each man went home he had the same experience as all the others. A note on the table from the wife said:

"I've taken the children and gone to visit a neighbor."

While puzzling over the strange notion of a visit to a neighbor by his wife and children at ten o'clock at night, a sharp rap was heard at the door. When the door was opened a man in a United States soldier's uniform handed him a letter, saluted, and turned away. The letter was brief:

"You are summoned to meet Santa Claus at eleven o'clock. He will have his automobile at your door in thirty minutes. Be ready without fail, at the hour, sharp." Signed by the hand of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States.

When the rap was heard again, the man was dressed in his best clothes and ready to go. A great automobile, as large as a moving van, was in waiting. When the man entered, he found the Town Council reassembled. Not one was missing. All were too much surprised to talk. Not a word was spoken as the automobile whirled over the hills to the top of the highest of the range, four miles away. When they were bidden to alight, they found themselves at the door of the great summer house which all recognized. Their fears vanished. Every window blazed with light. They were escorted to the door. Santa Claus, in full regalia, met them with a beaming face. He marched the distinguished visitors with great formality through room after room, all crowded with men, women and children in best attire.

The decorations of flowers and evergreens and vari-colored electric lights made it seem like wonderland. They were conducted to special, reserved seats upon a platform a little elevated above the rest of the floor. Right in front of them, in choice reserved seats, each man recognized his wife and children, faces wreathed with smiles and waving their hands, as happy as birds.

Near by was a platform, a little more elevated, filled with empty chairs. In some cunning hiding place an orchestra began to play "Hail to the Chief!" Everybody arose as a voice announced, "The President!" Sure enough, the host entered, accompanied by President Woodrow Wilson and a number of distinguished men of national fame. In answer to the salute, the President bowed and smiled as he said:

"My friends, the delightful vacation I spent in your state during the past summer tempted me to accept the kind invitation of my friend and neighbor to attend an old-fashioned Christmas festivity, with a real Santa Claus, fairies, angels, carols and all." As he spoke, a curtain was drawn aside and revealed a children's choir. Instantly they burst forth in a carol, just one verse, and sat down. The President continued:

"Christmas Trees! Christmas Turkeys! Cranberry Sauce, Plum Pudding, Toys, Christmas Gifts! All show that Old Saint Nicholas of our childhood days is here, as he has been for twenty centuries, and we trust will be for twenty centuries to come. He is but the impersonation of the Christmas feeling which prompts every one to try and make everybody else happy. The story of the Christ-Child in the Holy Book added new value to childhood, and inspired a tender sympathy and love for the little ones everywhere. In all Christian lands, in all Christian homes, all people unite to pay loving tribute to the dear old Saint Nick of their own happy childhood dreams. I greet you all and thank you for your hearty welcome."

The big boy had sought an interview with the President before he entered and confessed the liberties he had taken with the President's name, stationery, and soldiers' uniforms for the soldiers drafted for the night only. The President graciously pardoned the young rascal.

Turning to the platform occupied by the Town Council, he closed his address thus:

"I also take pleasure in greeting the Town Council of one of your neighboring mountain villages. Their Moderator, I am told, like myself, is a servant of our great Republic. I wish him and his associates, and you all, good friends, a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year."

While the music from the concealed orchestra continued, relieved at intervals by carols sung by the white-robed choir of girls and boys, a trained soldierly band of lads directed by their captain, the small boy, did wonders in assisting to serve the great company with refreshments of every kind. Then they bestowed upon all the children, toys, candy and oranges, and as a souvenir gave to each person the letter from the editor of the *Sun* to Virginia, printed in colors and gold, folded in a beautiful envelope with the President's monogram upon it.

"It was at a dinner party of laymen. The ladies had withdrawn, and the conversation had taken a turn that was dishonoring to Christ. One of the guests, who had said nothing, asked his host's permission to ring the bell. When the servant appeared, he ordered his carriage. Then, with quiet courtesy, he explained that he felt obliged to retire because he was 'still a Christian.' The guest's name was Sir Robert Peel. We need not always administer a rebuke in this way, but have we courage to make our position clear when our Lord is dishonored?"—*Selected.*

Then, too, history must be rewritten. Booth didn't "conspire" to kill Lincoln; he "agreed." Guy Fawkes "agreed" to blow up the House of Parliament. Certain Roman gentlemen "agreed" to remove Julius Cæsar. Emperor Paul I, of Russia was slain as the result of an "agreement." The regrettable demise of King Macbeth carried out the "agreement" of a lady not "infirm of purpose." Let the blue-pencil historians begin!—*The World.*

Why not? The Bible is blue-penciled by the school children, give them a chance at the history they have to study.

CURRENT COMMENT.

NOTHING ELSE TO DO.

It is impossible not to be moved by the sermon of Dr. Henry Van Dyke upon the heresy charges brought against four young men entering the Presbyterian ministry, one of them his son. It is impossible not to thrill with his indignant challenge.

"Whatever comes of the protest, I wish to take my stand with these young men. They are my brothers in the faith. If they are unfit for the ministry, I am unfit. Heresy trials are the delight of the ungodly and the despair of religion. But if such a thing must come, let it be fair and brave and open. Do not try it on eager-hearted, sensitive boys. Try it on a grown man who stands with them in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free."

But we fear Dr. Van Dyke does not understand the situation. He is past sixty. He has been preaching and teaching thirty-five years. Things have changed since he too was an "eager-hearted, sensitive boy."

There are no gunmen, no police grafters, no purveyors of vice. There are no commercial frauds, no poisoners of the people's food, no lying trade marks. There are no tyrannous employers, no striking employees with murder in their hearts and on their lips, no industrial riots, no sin, no crime. Peace is universal, plenty is for all, justice and righteousness reign triumphant.

There are no empty churches or empty pews. Moving picture houses are being converted into temples of religion. "Down-town" is spiny with spires. Where once stood the slums, a place of worship smiles its welcome on every block of model tenements. Young men of the highest type are rushing to the ministry in such numbers that civil life must suffer unless some of them are forced back upon it; and what measure is better fitted for that than inquiries about doctrinal points which shall rule out most of those who think, and admit the stupid and the hypocritical?

Of course if in this millennial age there were any real evangelical work to do, churchmen would not war on their finest spirits by trying them as heretics. But in a golden age these elimination tests seem necessary.—*New York World.*

One by one the alleged historical and scientific inaccuracies of the Bible are being disposed of. Skeptical criticism has plumed itself on discovering these assumed errors and challenging reverent scholarship to defend the biblical narrative. One of the best known of these challenged texts is Luke's statement, chapter 2, verse 2: This taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria." The difficulty involved lies in the fact that Cyrenius, or Quirinius, is known to have been governor of Syria in 6-7 A. D. and then conducted a census for the purpose of taxation, which taxation is mentioned in Acts 5:37. Apart from Luke's statement, there has been no historical evidence hitherto that Quirinius was governor of Syria in the year 4 B. C., so as to decree the taxing mentioned in Luke's Gospel. It has therefore been charged that Luke was mistaken and had confused the taxing by Quirinius in the year 6 A. D. with the alleged taxing of 4 B. C., and that therefore in reality there was no taxing in the year Jesus was born (which according to correct chronology was 4 B. C.). Those who have maintained the accuracy of Luke's account have claimed that there must have been a former governorship of Quirinius to which Luke refers in chapter 2:2. Sir William Ramsey is now able to produce proof that this claim has been justified. In a letter written some months ago to President Ketler of Grove City College, he said: "We had a wonderful season at Pisidian Antioch. We found the epigraphic record, proving by absolute contemporary evidence that Quirinius (Luke 2:2) was governing Syria 10-7 B. C. 'This was the first enrollment when Quirinius was governing Syria.' That is the victory in a long controversy. Luke is right in the most criticized statement of his whole two books." Thus is settled a controversy of long standing and settled in favor of the inerrancy of the Scriptures even in their minute historical allusions.

—*The Presbyterian of the South.*

John Adams: "The Bible is the best Book in the world."

THE CLUB.

HIGHER CRITICISM IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

In the earlier stage of the invasion of the Sunday School by the Counterfeit Critics, Dr. Daniel Curry, editor of *The Methodist Review,* uttered the following striking and forceful words of warning. Had it been heeded we might have been saved the contest now impending:

"The Sunday School Lessons constitute an agency in the religious teaching and culture of the times second in importance only to the doctrinal utterances of the evangelical pulpit. They year by year practically dictate the Biblical reading and study of most of the children and youth of the land; and as well, that of a large portion of those of riper years. By this means they are instrumentally shaping the theological conceptions of those who must very soon occupy the foremost places in the families and schools and churches of the land. The views and ideas now being formulated in such minds must go with them through life; or if ever gotten rid of, it must be by painful and perilous processes. All the wise sayings that have become the commonplaces of thought in respect to the determinative and abiding influences of early education—how the bending of the twig permanently inclines the tree, and how hard it is to teach old dogs new tricks—here become maxims of practical wisdom, and we are brought to contemplate a vast molding process in active operation, by which immortal souls are receiving impressions that are to be as lasting as their being. The thought is fearful to contemplate, in view of its magnitude and the preciousness of the interests involved.

"The discussions of some of the things in the 'lesson helps' found in some of the religious periodicals have led to a number of rather curious affairs. An official organ of one of our specifically evangelical Sunday School organizations introduced Abraham, in the proposed offering of Isaac, as an only partially rescued subject of ancestral idolatry which inculcated the practice of human sacrifices. In another case, an editor of a great weekly, who had engaged an able and scholarly minister to prepare the exposition of the Sunday School lessons, began very soon to detect an unusual odor about these contributions which reminded him of the 'Higher Criticism,' and made it necessary to subject the offered matter to a careful surveillance and the free use of the *penna expurgatoria.* Worst of all, the publisher of the incomparably ablest Sunday School periodical in the world—*The Sunday School Times*—having in his far-seeing and liberal enterprises engaged the pens of some of the ablest biblical scholars on both sides of the sea fully to expound the lessons and bring out all their hidden riches, soon found himself standing face to face with a rendering of the sacred narrative that would have delighted the hearts of the most advanced disciples of the school of Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Robertson Smith. But he was equal to the emergency, and the contract for supplies of that kind was peremptorily and speedily terminated. The Christian public should thank the editors who showed the courage to refuse to allow their periodicals to become the mediums for introducing distracting discussion of profound biblical questions among those who are necessarily unable to deal with them, and would quite certainly suffer harm from them."

"Our views in respect to the free use of legitimate biblical criticism, and of the intelligent, but reverent and cautious, re-examination of the theological formularies of former times, have been sufficiently indicated. But in order that this work shall be well done it must be intrusted to those whose pursuits have rendered them expert in it. It is not a work for children, of whatever stature or age; and all who are set to instruct the great technically unlearned masses should practically remember this in their ministrations."—*Methodist Review,* May, 1887.

THE CHURCH AND THE CIVIL LAW.

The opinion of Judge Van Valkenberg, of the Federal Court, in the Missouri Valley College case, sets forth certain fundamental principles which have not always been recognized by State courts, but which have been consistently maintained by the higher courts in most States and by the United States Supreme Court. Defining "Presbyterian property, and how it is held, and for whom, and in what such property rightly consists," Judge Van Valkenberg says:

In this Church the religious congregation or ecclesiastical body holding the property is but a subordinate member of the general church organization in which there are superior ecclesiastical tribunals with a general and ultimate power of control, more or less complete, in some supreme judicatory over the whole membership of that general organization. The local congregation is itself but a member of a much larger and more important religious organization, is under its government and control, and is bound by its orders and judgments. Therefore, when the property held by the church is that purchased or conveyed for the general use of the religious congregation, not devoted forever by the instrument which conveyed it nor by any specific declaration of its owner to the support of any special religious decrees, or any peculiar form of worship, it is and remains the property of the general Church which exercises such general ultimate power of control. It does not belong to the particular congregation which uses it, much less to the individual members of such a congregation. It does not belong to the presbytery or synod, nor, in a strict sense, to the General Assembly. It belongs to the Church, which is composed of its entire membership; that membership being governed and controlled by the organic law of the Church, the administration of which is lodged in certain judicatories rising, in regular succession, to the General Assembly or court of last resort, embracing in itself legislative, administrative and judicial powers. The government of the Presbyterian Church is republican and representative in character. Its administration is vested not in the individual members, not in the congregation, but in the General Assembly and the presbyteries; and the Church as a whole, acting through its supreme governing bodies exercises the ultimate rights of ownership and control over all its properties.

Following this, the judge touches on the relation of the individual members to the Church and their legal rights and the limitation of their rights as members. He says:

The Constitution of the United States and of the several States guarantees to the individual absolute independence of religious belief and worship. He need associate himself with no religious organization if he does not wish to do so, and he need remain identified with one no longer than he may desire; but when he does unite with a church, and becomes a member of that ecclesiastical body, he voluntarily surrenders his individual freedom to that extent. So long as he desires to avail himself of such a relationship, and to enjoy the privileges and benefits flowing from that association, he must conform to the laws by which it is governed. He can not complain if its articles of faith be changed, nor if its property—in which he has no individual ownership—be transferred under constitutional forms; in such case, he has no personal or property rights which the civil courts can or should protect. Any other view would be entirely subversive of the very theory of organization.

—*The Herald and Presbyter*

Modern thought has grown impatient with the Bible, the Gospel and the Cross. What part of the Bible has it not assailed? The Pentateuch it has long ago swept from the canon as unauthentic. Daniel is devoured bodily by the learned lions. And Jonah is swallowed by the deep monsters with a more inexorable voracity than the fish, for they never cast him up again. The histories and events of the great chronicle are rudely contradicted and gainsaid, because some schoolmaster, with a slate and pencil, cannot bring his sums right. And every miracle which the might of the Lord wrought for the favor of His people, or the frustration of their foes, is poohpoohed as an absurdity.—*Arthur Mursell.*

The Divine Unconquerable Word of God.

"What has the Bible done for man, and on man's world? Its annals—are they replete with records of good done, wrongs redressed, men saved, and God glorified? What are the facts?

1. "The book itself commands attention. The Vedas, the writings of Confucius, and the Koran are modern compared with it. When it was laid in complete form on the table of the world, it was found that forty centuries had made contributions of their best things to it. Its authorship is spread over sixteen hundred years. It has been copied during thirty centuries; and survived the wreck of empires, of mythologies, and philosophies—ministering to the true needs and deepest challenges of humanity. It has been assailed by all evil things; yet, in its turn, it has borne down on them with a power that destroys them. In harmony in itself with all the laws of God's kingdom, it moves with an energy derived from the Spirit. On opening its pages, we feel as if all around were unearthly and sublime, as if we approached the throne of its eternal Author; 'while, an unknown heaven appears opening on our meditations, in which we behold, as it were, a thousand burning luminaries, whose rays, gushing from every side, bewilder the eyes, and dazzle while they flood them with intolerable glory.'

"In the very constitution of the Bible there is evidence of one Divine mind, acting through and above all human agents for the production of one grand result—the eternal purpose of redemption in Christ Jesus. As the sun mirrors himself only in a calm ocean, so the living personal Jehovah mirrors Himself in the Bible as the God of providence and redemption, making the one uniform claim of faith on all men—faith in the Lord Jesus and His kingdom. As the revelation of salvation, it is the book of life, of unsearchable wealth, of Divine fulness—a copy of manifestation of the living Saviour; trying and judging all other sacred books in the world; the arbiter in history, in literature, and in morals. The vigor, beauty and purity of the ethical parts of the Bible; the matchless simplicity and charm of its histories; the sun of prophecy which has never set, but has rolled down a flood of light to our day; the poetry which, in 'flow and fire,' in crushing force, in majesty that stilll seems to echo the awful sounds of Sinai, is the most superb within the breast of man'—all these have made the Bible a mighty power in the world, through its influence on the human mind. The God whom it teaches us to worship is the only absolutely perfect One in holiness and love that man has ever known; nor heaven, nor earth, nor hell has known another Saviour besides the Lord Jesus whom it reveals; and the religion which it brings is the only one on the earth that does not degrade man nor insult God."

"2. The Bible has encountered prejudice, storm and undying hate. The Veda had no foes, the Zend-Avesta no enemies; and the Greeks accepted with acclamation the poems of Homer. Why is not the Bible, with its power to inspire the loftiest intelligence with love and veneration, with its matchless morals and its sublime spirituality, the book of every class of men, and of all men? Why do men of thought look coldly upon it? How comes it that in this scientific age, there is a spirit abroad of alienation from it? The ancient classical literature, which has charmed the intellectual world for twenty centuries, is pagan in ethics and mythology, and, therefore, antagonistic to the Bible. Modern letters, conformed in a great degree to ancient models, and derived from those fountain-heads, follow frequently the same course in depicting moral greatness; in ignoring those moral principles and sentiments peculiar to revealed religion; in propounding theories of life, happiness and immortality that are not distinctly Christian; in overlooking wholly or partially palliating, the depraved moral conditions of man, and in neglecting redemption by Jesus Christ.

"In looking into the schools of ancient philosophy, we see a faithful picture of heathen thought—of the inability of the loftiest intellect to arrive at truth, and of

the dimness of their light even at the best. These sages, debauched by false science, spoke in the language of the gods, and in reference to morality and religion sank lower than brutes. The intelligent belief in a future state, and the knowledge of moral obligation, were alike wanting in them. Some 'introduce us into the dark cave of materialism; others, like the modern skeptics, founded their freedom on the denial of every duty, and the obedience of every impulse; reason their only guide, at one time the moderator, at another the menial of passion;' while others, like the Stoics, gave the world 'a virtue without affections, a religion without a God, and a soul without a future.' The struggle between the theories and spirit of paganism and the principles of the Bible is not yet over. The infamous doctrines which prevailed in the France of the eighteenth century, notwithstanding the bloody commentary furnished on them by the Revolution, are rising again in formidable array; they seem to aim at the uprooting of all faith in the Bible. If for twenty centuries Holy Scripture has withstood every attempt to corrupt it, every cruel effort to wrench the signet ring of God from its finger, and every insidious war against the religious instincts of this million-peopled world—do not the hates that have pursued it, the fires that have been kindled to burn it, and the rude assaults of successions of infidels on it, prove it Divine and unconquerable? Thus they treated the Just One, and thus they treated His Book.

"The knowledge communicated by the Bible is unique, saving and of infinite value. No other book of any age or nation gives the same view of sin—as the violation of moral law, as an evil of infinite magnitude, as involving everlasting punishment, and as mirrored only in the sufferings and death of the Son of God. This is one of the discoveries that stamp the book with transcendent power and utility. Alone in the literature of all time, it presents to men the true idea of God—in essence, self-existent; in holiness and majesty and all moral attributes, infinite in wisdom and sovereignty, absolute—and this God seen in the face of Jesus Christ, crowned with a love which fills, and shall forever fill, the virtuous universe with the lights and splendors of the Godhead. And to this book alone, of all books, we are indebted for the idea of that redemptive system, of which the central figure is Immanuel—a personality so strange, new, peculiar, so suited to man in his indigence and guilt, and so suited to God for the manifestations of Himself as Father of the universe that the mind of man or angel never could have suggested or conceived it.

"The religion of the Bible is not poetry, a code of morals or a series of rhapsodies—it is salvation from sin and death. The negations of Islam repudiate the divinity and propitiation of the Lord Jesus and substitute fabulous creeds. The gods of the heathen were and are unholy; and their worshippers, coloured and transformed by their homage, resemble them in immorality, cruelty and misery. The sacred literature of Paganism possesses small claim to attention. It gives no reliable information. It has involved the great majority of the human race in darkness, and subjected them to a sure process of deterioration; which became greater as age succeeded age; and history proves the inability of men to redeem themselves from idolatry, or restore humanity to its primeval purity and happiness. Let the contributions made by the Bible to human knowledge be fairly considered—let them be weighed, estimated and compared, and they will be found to involve the recovery of man, his enlightenment by truth along the whole line of his immorality, and the germination within him of a new life, which has no superior in the universe but the life of God. The quality of this knowledge has been tested by time—by the fires of persecution, the scalpel of genius and erudition—by men in every condition, and by death-beds innumerable as the buds of spring—by the ridicule and sneer of the skeptic, and by the more perilous weapons of unscientific disbelief, and the result has proved it to be saving, Divine, infinite—possessing in itself the potency of all greatness and of all good." —*Selected.*

George Washington: "It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible."

OUR COZY CORNER

A Chat With Our Readers.

"I am delighted with the CHAMPION. The Church needs it—must have what it preaches or die."

"The CHAMPION is a staunch defender 'of the faith once delivered to the saints.' I eagerly await its monthly visits and it has the 'right of way' in reading, except the Bible, until it is carefully read through. The CHAMPION is a vigorous offspring of The Bible Student and Teacher, which latter I have bound, since 1904, and frequently consult."

"I have read with interest your Plan of Campaign and am very much in earnest when I tell you that I wish you every success, and but for my poor health, would try very hard to get subscribers for the magazine, as I am convinced it is a greatly needed work. I do think THE BIBLE CHAMPION is grand. I enclose two dollars."

"THE BIBLE CHAMPION ought to be in the hands of every clergyman and church officer. Many of them, more than most people realize, would oppose it and throw it aside without reading it. But it has done (as B. S. & Teacher) and will do great good. It does seem that God must prosper such a work."

"THE BIBLE CHAMPION in my judgment meets a real need of the hour. I have read Modern Scholarship as it is called, and in my opinion it springs more difficulties than it removes. I ask myself how much force would the Bible stories have on our children if we were to tell them these things did not happen but they are fables and folklore. I will circulate my copy. Enclosed find $1.00 for my subscription."

"In response to your appeal to Canadian readers of THE BIBLE CHAMPION to send you their appreciation of your magazine, I hereby write to assure you of my hearty sympathy and wish you such success as will ensure continuance of publication while need for it exists. Your paper should regularly be received by our ministers. With them rests the safety of the position of the Bible. Our college professors should know that there is another view rather than that the critics' view is the only one. I say this because of my experience with some students whom I met and were taught by one who is a post-graduate of a German university and knowing only the destructive view of criticism. I purpose doing some canvassing for you before long, and to help spread knowledge of the existence of THE BIBLE CHAMPION. I enjoy every copy I receive and read them all."

"Your article, 'The Fabulous Bible,' in the January BIBLE CHAMPION I have read with care, and find it truly scholarly, sound and evangelical, and calculated to do good in service in the defense of the Bible. Kent's book I have not seen, nor need I see it, for you give me in a nutshell both sides of the question."

"I wish to heartily commend you for your article in the January number of THE BIBLE CHAMPION entitled 'The Fabulous Bible.' I have not read the book, and after your review of it, I probably shall not. Life is too short to spend time in reading what is called a historical book, written by a man who evidently has no knowledge of the elementary principles of evidence as held by the courts of the civilized world for the last four hundred years. When a man puts into a book called a history, that St. Paul's statement in the 15th chapter of First Corinthians, is the earliest and most direct testimony of the Resurrection of Christ that we have, it is too much for me or any other lawyer. Your comments leave nothing to be said. No lawyer could better them. I will only add that the editor of the *Adult Class Monthly,* whoever he may be (for I do not know), ought to be discharged for incompetency for recommending such a book, and some man put in his place who has some knowledge of what constitutes direct testimony."

EDITOR'S WHAT NOT.

THE DELUGE—NO ARK.

Americans are a people proverbially slow to wrath. They are so optimistic and good-natured that they will endure considerable wrong-doing before they become aroused. When endurance has ceased to be a virtue, and the offence becomes wanton and grievous, the tempest of passion which bursts forth, far surpasses that of most peoples. The evil-doers, terrified by the dawn of the day of judgment, cease their wicked trifling. Like those other evil-doers, of whom the Scriptures speak, "they say to the mountains and to the rocks, fall on us and hide us, . . . for the day of wrath is come: and who is able to stand." (Rev. vi. 16.) When Judge Lynch takes the bench, the defiant law-breakers take to the woods.

The twenty thousand or more Ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church are all Christians; but, at heart, they are Americans, first, last and all the time. They find no conflict between their patriotism and their religion. When they are fully convinced that the small per cent. of their number, who have been most highly favored and honored, not content with having enjoyed the places of honor and the positions of emolument, in their pride and vain-glory seem determined to destroy the great Church that has elevated them, such a day of wrath will dawn as the denomination has never known. What will add fire to the wrath is the knowledge that the evil threatens not the Church merely, but the Nation. The overthrow of the authority of the Bible as the Word of God, inevitably, will incite such appalling wickedness that America will have good reason to re-read the history of the great nations of the past, whom rejection of God and His Word brought down to overwhelming ruin.

If the ninety out of every hundred Ministers, who are loyal to their ordination vows, will but each drop a postal card to the editor of their local Advocate, merely suggesting, "Be true to your Trust," the wheels of the Press will begin to grind. When the denominational Press declares the will of the Church as expressed by the last General Conference, the end of the shame and disgrace will be in sight. So far but one periodical (*The Adult Bible Class Monthly*) has had the hardihood to pose as the *avant courier* of the infidel corps. When those guilty of this disregard of authority and violation of their own pledges of honor hear the rumble of the coming storm, they will know the Deluge is near and *there is no Ark.* If they will be warned by the words of the Apostle Peter (2 Peter iii. 3-7), they will learn that before their day "were scoffers walking after their own lusts, saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation. They willingly are ignorant . . . that the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." They will do well to remember that "the heavens and the earth which are now, are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."

"OF WHOM THE WORLD IS NOT WORTHY."

Churches, like kings, "climb to eminence over the graves of men." Their gratitude, too, like that of kings, "is the vainest of all things." Still there is always a compensation for every ill. "Authority forgets the dying king," and power drops easily from the grasp of a dying Church. What would the Christian Church be without the faithful, humble, obscure, Minister, whose chief function, as he so often hears, is *to serve?*

The Editor of THE CHAMPION, in a canvass of two thousand Churches in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the interest of Veteran Ministers, of choice sought a hearing from one thousand of the small, obscure and unknown churches. As the guest of the thousand heroes, who were the Pastors, he learned the story of the inner life of all, with its self-denials, its deprivations, its hopeless outlook, so far as any immediate relief appeared. Not a single complaint of God, or fault-finding with His Providential leading, was ever uttered. The number who were incompetent and doing better than

they could do in worldly avocations, was such a small per cent. as to be infinitesimal. A multitude had turned aside from opportunities of worldly advantage, and preferment. A great number were always facing invitations to turn aside to worldly business and double, treble, and not a few increase ten-fold, their present income. When frankly asked what kept them at their post, instant and emphatic was the response: "I believe in God and in His Word." Not a Higher Critic was found in the thousand. When I frankly put the question, the answer was ever the same, and many times in almost the same identical words: "If I did not believe the Bible was the Word of God, would I stay at this post one single hour?"

The Sand-Hog, in this country is a new profession. It is that of the toiler underground. The work is hard, the pay is small, comparatively, for the life is short and full of ever-menacing peril. Yet these humble toilers know that without them the great under-world undertakings, piers, that make bridges possible, foundations of sky-scrapers, underground railways, would all be impossible.

It would be sacrilege to suggest that the heroic minister is "the sand-hog of the Church." Yet without him, what would happen? He is the agent, without profit, for every church project; he is the collector, without commission, for every obligation; he is the messenger for every errand, and always at his own wages. Unconscious, or forgetful of his own worth and merit, he is content to toil in the "trenches," known not by name but by a number. He is down upon the books of his superiors in office as the $300, the $500, the $600, man. He is the pawn who is sent to fill the places left, after "the chosen" men are appointed. His compensation, sometimes, comes by reaching the *king-row* and earning a crown. Great editors, professors, secretaries, Bishops even, have been created by one who was counted as scarcely ordinary by his competitors, *counting* a vote or two more than the field. It is not an idle statement, but one that is specifically true, that there is no position in the denomination, high or low, that cannot be filled without seeking or effort, from the ranks of those "of whom the world is not worthy." The Church would move on as smoothly and the work be just as successful as in any period of her history.

The moral of this screed is so clear that it needs no emphasis, more than mere statement. If the Church permits the *pseudo* scholar to sow the seeds of distrust of the Bible as the Word of God, without rebuke, *the under-man may learn to doubt.* When he does, the end has come to Christianity.

FROM BAD TO WORSE.

The record of the Adult Bible Class Monthly for 1913 is very unenviable. It appears that an effort will be made to do worse, if that is possible, in 1914. The January number, 1914, contains references to four Commentaries, all of which are crassly heterodox—the *International Critical Commentary,* the *Cambridge Bible,* the *New Century Bible,* and the *Dummelow's Commentary.* In the Book reviews we find the following notices of three of these Commentaries:

"For those who desire to go deepest into the questions involved in the study of the Gospels, *The International Critical Commentary* stands first." After speaking of the books on St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke, this remark is added: "Wise adult Bible class members should urge these books for the class library."

"More compact in size and content is *The Cambridge Bible,* which gives both lucid comment upon the text and also clear discussions of the times and problems of the books considered. . . . A class library set of these commentaries ought to be started.

"*The New Century Bible* presents such discussions as are essential to a knowledge of the book, subject, author, times, date problems, the place of the books in the ancient church, etc. . . . It may be easily carried in one's pocket."

The following authors are referred to, all of whom are well known to be ultra Counterfeit Critics: M'Giffert, Hastings, Drummond, Shailer Matthews, Harnack, and Charles Foster Kent. The latter is the favorite, as his name appears seven times.

In the Book reviews we find this notice: "*The Life and Teachings of Jesus,* by Charles Foster Kent, follows the general

plan of the preceding volumes of the *Historical Bible*. With a concise putting of the records outside the Gospels, the contents, characteristics, written sources, literary history, and date of the Gospels, and the historical background of Jesus's life and work, the life and fundamental teachings of the Master are treated by a presentation of the text with discussion thereon in relation to collateral data and thought pertaining to the teaching involved. It stirs to vigorous thinking and sense of responsibility."

This additional note may be of interest to all Methodists: "Any of the books mentioned here can be secured through the Methodist Book Concern or its Depositories. It is hoped that the thousands who are asking for books of this character will make such use of these pages, as will enable them to justify their own desires for deep and earnest study of the life and ministry of the Master and the development of Christian character of those who walked by his side throughout his earthly career."

To have such books named and commended in literature prepared for orthodox Sunday Schools, as helps in the study of the lesson, is as reprehensible as it would be to commend for the purpose, Paine's *Age of Reason*, or Ingersoll's *Mistakes of Moses*.

The August number of THE BIBLE CHAMPION in the article calling attention to the prostitution of this Monthly to the dissemination of doctrines more deadly than Christian Science, quoted as follows from Dr. R. J. Cook (then Book Editor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, now Bishop):

"The Methodist Book Concern can not become the distributing agent for rationalistic literature, however pious its vocabulary, nor the propaganda for the dissemination of doctrines, or any other kind of literature, however cleverly written, and whether true or not, which are not in harmony with the teachings and spirit of the Methodist Episcopal Church."

James D. Dean: "By proving the record true, science pronounces it divine; for who could have correctly narrated the secrets of eternity but God Himself?"

"SHIFTING" SUNDAY SCHOOL INSTRUCTION.

James M. Gray, D.D., Dean of the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, one of our Board of Directors, has in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* a very striking article. We have permission to use it. We quote from it in "The Club" and will add other items in other issues. Dean Matthews refers to Sunday School instruction as "shifting" from orthodoxy. We have taken considerable pains to ascertain what the evangelical periodicals of this country are teaching in their notes on the Sunday School lessons. The series just closed was from the Old Testament and furnished the best possible opportunity to test whether or not they were true to evangelical standards. We have failed to find a single instance where comments on the lesson, even when it treated of the Miracles which the pseudo-scientists repudiate with guffaws of laughter as fables, legends or myths, that did not teach the lesson in exact Bible language. No evangelical publication house has dared to insert even the tiniest bit of counterfeit critical interpretation. If any of our readers know of a single instance we will thank them to give us name, date and lesson. Evangelical Christianity has submitted in silence too long to this blatant boasting. The time has come to call to account the slanderers and brand them with the good old-fashioned name, as Dr. Gray is doing in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

DIFFERENCES IN THE GOSPEL RECORDS.

The claim made by the friends of the Bible is, that while the four evangelists differ in their statements, they are not in conflict with one another, that the differences in most instances easily can be explained; and in some cases make it clear that there was among the writers neither collusion nor forgery.

Names mentioned in Gospel according to John, but not given by the other evangelists, afford an example in point.

Matthew, Mark and Luke say that one of the disciples drew his sword and smote the High Priest's servant, but mention no names. John, on the other hand, gives the

name of the apostle, also that of the servant.

A brief examination of the different conditions under which the records were made will make it clear why John alone mentions the names of these persons. Had the name of Peter been published at the time when the three earlier accounts were written he would have been in danger of arrest; had the name of the servant been given he might have been subjected to all sorts of annoyances.

At length, 36 or 37 A. D., Caiaphas was deposed from the High Priesthood, and the power of Annas his father-in-law, was at an end. Their official households were scattered and in A. D. 90, or later, there was no further need of withholding names and accordingly John writes that it was Peter who drew the sword and that the "servant's name was Malchus."

It is also noticeable that Matthew, Mark and Luke refrain from giving the name of any Christian residing in Judea; nor do they mention any miracle, or discourse of Jesus by which fanatical and resentful priest, or Jew, might misrepresent and thus bring trouble to the infant church. But there was no need that the apostle John should exercise this reserve and accordingly much that the other evangelists do not mention, he was free to record.

These examples show the importance of thorough investigation before passing adverse judgments upon the apparent lack of harmony in the Bible records.

L. T. T.

HELL.

The word "Hell" is banished from polite society. The pulpit avoids offence by learnedly quoting from the revised version, "Sheol," "Hades," "Gehenna." The word, however, still remains as a choice tid-bit of profanity. Reform finds it a picturesquely descriptive term for extremely disreputable places and wretchedly undesirable conditions. So it is probable the word will not be wholly lost to human language. It may be well to note that the word is used in the New Testament twenty-two times. Jesus used it fifteen times. Eleven times the American Revised Version uses "hell" with a foot-note saying "Gehenna." So that, after all allowances have been made, it appears that Jesus used the disagreeable word eleven times. We have been very fortunate in securing for our readers the subject matter of Professor Townsend's lectures on this subject delivered in Tremont Temple, Boston, last January.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

The Bibliotheca Sacra is to be congratulated upon its long and brilliant career. It has no superior in the character of the subjects treated, and for the intellectual ability and literary rank of its contributors. The Editor, G. Frederick Wright, LLD., alone is enough to make the Quarterly one of the foremost leaders of the world in the realm which has commanded the interest and labor of his whole life. The Bible Champion is not only highly honored, but greatly favored in name and under the direction of its new Board of Directors in being associated with *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. All new subscribers to the Bibliotheca Sacra may secure both Magazines for one year for $2.50. This should be paid in advance and sent to The Bible Champion.

"It is a crying shame that such pernicious teaching should poison the minds of the young as to the verities of God's Word."

"I am now a subscriber to the Champion. I was a subscriber for years to the old magazine. Since you have become editor, and it has assumed its new form, I am more than ever in love with it. I wish every minister and Christian layman would read it. I praise God for such Champions of his Word as yourself and the magazine. I pray for you every success, and may shame and defeat utterly overwhelm the co-workers of the devil who are blasting at our Rock of Ages."

Ulysses S. Grant: "Hold fast to the Bible as the sheet anchor of your liberties; write its precepts in your hearts and practice them in your lives."